

*Gallo O'h*  
LECTURES

ON THE

C R E E D

OF

Pope *P I U S IV,*

OR THE

TRENT Confession of FAITH:

WHEREIN *L. O. K*

The Arguments of Cardinal *Bellarmino*, and other approved Writers of the *Roman Church*, in vindication of the principal Tenets of Popery, as distinguished from Primitive Christianity, are examined and confuted.

---

*Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God.*

DEUT. IV. 2.

---

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. F. and C. RIVINGTON,  
No. 62, St. Paul's Church-yard.

---

M, DCC, LXXXV.

*4*





TO THE WORTHY  
PROTESTANT INHABITANTS  
OF  
THE PARISH OF \*\*\*,

WHO HAVE INVARIABLY EXHIBITED A RATIO-  
NAL AND WELL-GROUNDED ABHORRENCE  
OF THE SENSELESS TENETS AND TYRAN-  
NICAL PRINCIPLES OF POPERY,

THE FOLLOWING DISCOURSES

ARE WITH SINCERE REGARD INSCRIBED,

By their faithful and obedient Servant,

O. S.

C  
of  
be  
u  
re  
A  
d  
ac  
fi  
an  
G  
n  
tu  
th  
ec  
M  
fa  
fe  
in  
B  
a

---

## P R E F A C E.

**C**HRI<sup>ST</sup>IAN Salvation, the promise of eternal Life and Happiness, it must be allowed, is not to be ascertained to us, without the due performance of requisite conditions on our part. And, inasmuch as Faith and Obedience, or such Repentance as may be accepted in the room of perfect, un-finning obedience, are the stipulated, and indispensable conditions of the Gospel Covenant; and Faith, that genuine Christian Faith which the Scripture requires, being every where in the New Testament as strictly enjoined, as conformity in practice to the Moral Precepts of the Gospel; not to say, that even a greater respect and deference is paid to the veracity of God, in receiving those truths, in which his Being, Attributes, Providence, and his adoration are concerned, than in executing



cuting his moral commands, in which ourselves, our neighbours, or our interests in this world, are involved; on these accounts, it evidently concerns every man, himself, to believe aright, rather than take his religion upon trust, or, to use a more homely, but not less significant phrase, to pin his faith on another man's sleeve, if he would secure his final acceptance with God, as a wise, a good, and faithful servant, who suffered not his talent to lie unimproved, *lest a promise being made us, of entering into his rest, any of us should seem to come short of it.*

That Faith, then, which is contained in the Gospel, as has been long since acknowledged by the Romanists as well as ourselves, is contained in those ancient summaries of our religion, the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. But to the latter of these Creeds, or Symbols, in the middle of the sixteenth century, the Council of Trent, by and with the direction of the reigning Pontiff, (Pius IV.) added twelve more Articles, to which that Council (Sess. 24.) adjoined this profession,

feſſion, viz. of “ This is the true Ca-  
 “ tholic faith, without which no man  
 “ can be ſaved.” The deſign, there-  
 fore, of the following ſheets, is to  
 evince the falſity of this declaration,  
 and even on the contrary to ſhew,  
 that the Salvation of thoſe, is greatly  
 endangered, who wilfully embrace  
 thoſe articles of the Romiſh Church,  
 and conform their practice to them.

Theſe diſcourſes were, in ſubſtance,  
 delivered to a country congregation,  
 in a quarter of this kingdom where  
 Popery has long erected its ſtandard;  
 and were undertaken, by particular  
 deſire, with a view to eſtabliſh a ſtated  
 courſe of Lectures on the Trent  
 Creed, as that may be looked upon  
 as the ſummary and ſtandard of the  
 Marian religion; and are now com-  
 mitted to the preſs, chiefly with an  
 intention of placing them in the hands  
 of ſuch of the Editor’s hearers, as may  
 poſſibly want leiſure, opportunity, or  
 inclination, to refer to larger works  
 on this ſubject; on which, it is true,  
 enough has already appeared in the  
 world, though not ſo fully known as  
 might

might be wished. The sophistical arguments of Popery have been confuted, or their weakness exposed, times without number ; but without urging any thing further in its recommendation, the motive already declared to be the Editor's primary inducement for printing this work, it is presumed, will preclude the necessity of any further apology for its publication. *aye &*

*for*

---

# CONTENTS.

## LECTURE I.

The uncertainty of Tradition, especially when placed in competition with the Scriptures, as a rule of faith. *Page 1.*

MARK VII. 7.

*In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*

## LECTURE II.

The right of Private Judgement, in the interpretation of Scripture, vindicated.

*P. 29*

2 COR. I. 24.

*Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy; for by faith ye stand.*

## LECTURE III.

The Sacraments of the Christian dispensation not more than two. *P. 57*

1 COR. IV. 1, 2.

*Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of the mysteries of God. Moreover it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful.*

LE C.



LECTURE IV.

The doctrine of a sinner's Justification by the Gospel stated, in contradistinction to Legal Justification, and as opposed to the Trent doctrine of Merit. P. 95.

EPHES. II. 8, 9.

*By Grace ye are saved, through Faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast.*

LECTURE V. PART I.

Of the sacrifice of the Mass. P. 126.

HEB. X. 11.

*But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.*

LECTURE V. PART II.

Transubstantiation. P. 148.

I COR. XI. 23, 24.

*The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.*

LEC-

LECTURE VI.

Half-Communion, or the sacrilege of the Church of Rome, in withholding the cup from the Laity. P. 182

MATTH. XXVI. 27, 28.

*And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins.*

LECTURE VII.

Purgatory.

P. 219

I JOHN, I. 7.

*The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin.*

LECTURE VIII:

Adoration of Saints and Reliques. Pleas of the Romanists in vindication of it, groundless. P. 260

MATTH. IV. 10.

*It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

LECTURE IX:

The Image-worship of Papists, no less idolatrous than that of Pagans. P. 286

EXOD. XX. 5.

*Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them.*

LEC-

[ viii ]

LECTURE X.

The doctrine of Indulgences. P. 323

EZEK. XXII. 27.

*Destroy souls to get dishonest gain.*

LECTURE XI. PART I.

The Church of Rome not the mother or  
mistress of all Churches. P. 340

I COR. XIV. 36.

*What? came the word of God out from you,  
or came it unto you only?*

LECTURE XI. PART II.

Absurdity of the Anti-christian doctrine  
of the Papal Supremacy exposed. P. 357

MATTH. XXIII. 8.

*Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your master,  
even Christ.*

LECTURE XII.

Some account of general Councils.—How  
abused by Papists.—Objections to that  
of Trent.—Brief summary of divers cor-  
ruptions of the Roman Church.—The  
diabolical principle of persecution.

P. 387

Application.

GEN. XLIX. 6.

*O my soul, come not thou into their secrets;  
unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou  
united.*

---

---

# LECTURE I.

MARK VII. 7.

*In vain do they worship me, teaching for  
Doctrines the Commandments of Men.*

OUR blessed Saviour is here represented as describing a sect of men pretending to uncommon sanctity, and who made the most considerable figure in the Jewish Church. But notwithstanding their high and boasted pretences, as strict Observers of Religious Ordinances beyond the practice of the rest of their brethren of the Jewish people, he condemns them as the grand corrupters of God's true Religion; as the authors and abettors of the grossest errors in doctrine, and depravity in manners: they transgressed the Commandments of God by their Traditions; they taught for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.

If then we direct our views to a sect of

B

a



a similar character among Christians, the Scribes and Pharisees of the Church of *Rome*, the authors of many gross corruptions of the religion of Christ; may we not affirm that this severe charge of our Saviour against such vain pretenders to sanctity, in the words of Isaiah, of *honouring God with their lips, while their heart is far from him*, is once more prophetic; and that they have in like manner rendered themselves obnoxious to this heavy imputation of teaching the fear of the Lord by the precepts of men, *rejecting the Commandments of God, that they may keep their own traditions?*

Certain it is, that in the primitive ages, and for many centuries after Christ, there appear not any footsteps of this sect in the Christian Church. We trace out the date of its birth in later times; in times of confusion and general ignorance. In those dark ages of the Gospel there arose a new set of instructors, who introduced a different sort of learning, and made fresh refinements in the scheme of religion. Instead of the Gospel simplicity, scholastic subtilties; instead of the plain, genuine, and intelligible Doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, their own absurd impious devices, and cunningly-devised fables were propagated and obtruded upon the ignorant and unwary, under the venerable name of Ecclesiastical Traditions.

Traditions. To these they exact a rigorous regard, and observe their own institutions with a superstitious punctuality; while, at the same time, it is too notorious, on what easy terms they dispense with the more weighty matters of the moral law. Should it be demanded how, and at what time it came to pass, that so great and general an apostasy took place in that church, which styles herself the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, it may be answered, that in assuming that title, and claiming obedience to her Pontiff as to the Universal Bishop and Supreme Father of Christendom, were that the only instance of her defection, the Church of Rome visibly departed from that primitive purity and moderation which was repeatedly recommended and practised by our Saviour himself, by his Apostles, and their more immediate successors. This title of Universal Bishop, it seems, was first obtained at the beginning of the seventh century by Boniface the Third, from the usurper Phocas, in return for the compliment which the Pope had paid to Phocas by confirming his title to the empire; though, to arrive at that dignity, he had basely murdered his predecessor, and all his family. To this æra, therefore, the first revelation of Anti-christ is referred by some; but the

beginning of the grand apostasy, or defection of the Romish church, is, by credible witnesses, placed at a much earlier period. Before the reign of Constantine, as the state of the Christian church was sufficiently humiliating, so, though the mystery of iniquity, foretold by the Apostles, had already begun to work, yet dare it not exhibit such marks of its genuine deformity as it has continued to do ever since that time. The encouragement, and support afforded by that Emperor, after his conversion, though his donation of all Italy to the church be known to be a forged account of the Romanists, still the assistance which he is supposed to have granted, together with the removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople, was a temptation to luxury, avarice, and ambition, which those aspiring and worldly prelates, the Bishops of Rome, could by no means withstand. They failed not to take immediate advantage of the absence of their lawful Sovereign; and snatching the reins of government into their own *hand*, after various struggles with the laity, over whom they at length prevailed, they made themselves supreme in temporal, as well as in spiritual jurisdiction. St. Jerome, who wrote at the close of the fourth century, complains of the avarice and corruption of the clergy

clergy in his time, and of that prohibition of marriage and meats which was literally forerold by St. Paul ; and St. Austin at the same time declares how the church was fallen from her purity.

Such were the preparatives for the rising up of the *man of sin*, till after a speedy advancement of the Papal Hierarchy, attended with a no less gradual defection from the truth, in the beginning of the 12th century, during the tyrannical pontificate of Innocent the Third, that pretended father of Christendom, exhibited the most palpable marks of Antichrist full grown. To justify so heavy an imputation, a slight acquaintance with the historical accounts of the lives of those Pontiffs, and the manners of the times in which they have successively lorded it over God's heritage, will suffice. Enough of this, as far as relates to the new-framed Doctrines of the Church of Rome, may be collected from the Trent Confession of Faith, not improperly called the Pope's Creed, as it is known to have been the general complaint of that time, that the decrees of the Trent Council were altogether dictated by the Pope himself.

With an intention of treating of each of these articles in their order, it shall be my present business to examine the first of them, which we find thus expressed.



“ I most firmly admit and embrace the  
 “ apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions,  
 “ and other observations and constitutions  
 “ of the said Church.” It is likewise  
 decreed in the same Council of Trent,  
 that ecclesiastical traditions are to be re-  
 ceived with equal affection and veneration  
 with the Holy Scripture. The Pa-  
 pists, it seems, are unwilling to own that  
 they esteem the traditions of men more  
 highly than the word of God; whereas, if  
 they receive them with equal affection of  
 filial piety, they slight and undervalue the  
 Scriptures of Truth. In this they dare not  
 plead not guilty; and it is indeed more safe  
 with them to neglect the Scriptures, than  
 their priestly traditions and impositions.

With regard to Councils, whether general, special, or local, I shall take occasion here to premise thus much; that their authority has been too much revered for want of their being better known, and the motives for their assembling being rightly understood. It were much to be wished that the chief, and only object in view had ever been the regulation of the discipline of the Church, and that only; for, not to mention many improper occasions of such meetings, altogether foreign to their original design, when once they undertake to use compulsion in order to enforce their decrees,

decrees, they may make impostors, hypocrites, and enemies to Christianity, but can never make true and sincere converts to the religion of the meek and holy Jesus. What an endless source this method of inculcating religious tenets has ever proved of wars and outrage, domination and servitude, wickedness and sorrows, and of every human woe, the historians of every age and country will inform us. By this, millions have fallen; and by this, Mahometanism seems to have been raised, and justified by example, in exercising the sword over the soul, and laying the world waste. Should these men, again, proceed from discipline to doctrine, and take upon them to coin new articles of faith for others, as if the plain and easy truths of Christianity were not intelligible to an ordinary capacity, whatever penalties and denunciations they may annex to injunctions of their own devising, they may rest assured, that in so doing they stand excommunicated, even by the sentence of their own thundering anathemas: they incur the displeasure of Almighty God, and of his holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul; the latter of whom, in his Epistle to the Galatians, thus repeatedly declares, *Though we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.*

On this head I shall only add, that this of Trent was so far from being a free and general council, that is, an assembly of delegates from every part of the Christian world, and not confined to representatives of the Roman Church, that it is known to have been no other than a packed conventicle, commissioned by the Pope, as I have already intimated. And to confirm this assertion, I shall give the following short account of that meeting in the words of Andrew Durithius, at that time Bishop of five churches, in his epistle to the Emperor Maximilian. "What good (says he) could be done in that council in which the votes were not weighed, but numbered? If goodness of the cause, if reason had been the weapon to fight withal, though we were few, we had vanquished a great army of our enemies. But seeing that numbers only came into the field, in which we were far inferior to them, tho' our cause were good, we could not possibly prevail. The Pope had a hundred to one; and in case those had not been enough, he could have created a thousand more to have helped at need. We daily saw hungry and needy Bishops come to Trent; youths for the most part given over to luxury and riot, hired only to give their voice as the Pope pleased. They

" They were both unlearned and simple,  
 " yet fit for the purpose, in regard of their  
 " impudent boldness. When these were  
 " added to the Pope's old flatterers, ini-  
 " quity triumphed; and it was impossible  
 " to determine of any thing, but as they  
 " pleased, who thought it to be the  
 " highest point of their religion to main-  
 " tain the authority and luxury of the  
 " Pope. A grave and learned man was  
 " there, who was not able to endure so  
 " great an indignity: he was presently  
 " traduced as being no good Catholic,  
 " and was terrified, threatened, and per-  
 " secuted, that he might approve things  
 " against his will. In short, matters were  
 " brought to that pass, by the iniquity of  
 " those who came thither fitted and pre-  
 " pared, that the Council seemed to consist,  
 " not of Bishops, but of disguised maskers;  
 " not of men, but of images, such as Dæ-  
 " dalus made, that moved by nerves which  
 " were none of their own. They were  
 " hireling Bishops, who, like wind-instru-  
 " ments, could not speak but as breath was  
 " put into them. The Holy Ghost had  
 " nothing to do in this assembly; all the  
 " counsels given there proceeded from hu-  
 " man policy, and tended only to maintain  
 " the Pope's immoderate and shameful do-  
 " mination."



Such were the imposers of this new faith, which they have the arrogance to call *Catholic*.

The particulars of this I have undertaken to examine; and in order to proceed regularly with the subject in hand, I shall first give some account of traditions in general; after which, I hope to prove as follows:—

That there are traditions which the Papists reject, though plainly apostolical: That they call some Apostolical, which are not to be met with in any writings of the Apostles, nor for several succeeding ages: That, again, they hold some traditions which are directly contrary to scripture, and to the declared sense of the whole Christian Church for many centuries;—and lastly, that they maintain others which have their institution wholly from the Church, and are therefore called ecclesiastical; in which they contradict themselves, as well as the scriptures.

To begin with the first of these—

Tradition, it is to be observed, is any way of delivering a thing or word to another: and so every doctrine of Christianity is by tradition. *I have delivered unto you* (saith St. Paul) *that Christ died for our sins.* And agreeably to this assertion, the *faith delivered* in St. Jude is the same which St. Paul

Paul explains by saying *the traditions*, that is the doctrines, ye were taught.

Irenæus calls it a tradition Apostolical, that Christ took the cup, and said it was his blood; and to believe in one God, and in Christ who was born of a virgin, was the old tradition, that is, the account delivered, and not at first written, which *the Barbarians kept diligently*.

But tradition signified either preaching or writing, as it happened.

When it signified preaching, it was only the first way of communicating the religion of Christ; and till the scriptures were written and consigned by the full testimony of the Apostles and Apostolical Churches respectively, it was usual in questions of religion to appeal to the traditions, or the constant retention of certain doctrines, in those churches where the Apostles first preached. Thus again, saith Irenæus, "If the Apostles had not left the scriptures, must we not have followed the order of tradition which they delivered to them to whom they intrusted the church; to which ordination many nations of Barbarians do assent?" And that which was true then, is also now; for if the Apostles had never written at all, we must have followed tradition, unless God provided for us some better thing. But

since God hath supplied not only the principal churches with the scriptures, but even all the nations which the Greeks and Romans called barbarous, to run now to tradition, would, at best, be quitting a certain for a very uncertain rule. In this case the difference and distance of times make the greatest alteration imaginable in the nature of the thing itself. The traditions at the first publication of the scriptures were clear, evident, recent, perfectly remembered, talked of by all Christians in their meetings public and private: a mistake was not probable among those who endeavoured carefully to remember them; and, had that happened, it were easily rectified whilst an Apostle, or any of their immediate Disciples were still living. During the lives of the Apostles, therefore, the heresies that were, stung clandestinely, but made no great shew; nor, even after that period, did any heresy pretend a foundation in *scripture*; but in *tradition*, many. So that the further we find ourselves removed from the primitive times of the Gospel, the less, of course, must be our dependance on mere *oral tradition*; of the uncertainty of which rule there have never been wanting crafty and designing seducers, who, *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, have made the word of God of none effect through their traditions.* To

To justify this charge against the teachers of the Roman Communion, I proceed to discuss the subject in question in the order I have already laid down.

For a specimen of traditions which the Papists reject, though plainly and undeniably Apostolical, we need only have recourse to our Bibles, where every dispassionate and unbiassed reader will find these doctrines clearly inculcated:—That Jesus Christ is the only head of the church—that he and his Apostles expressly require all men to search the scriptures—that every man is required to judge for himself in things necessary to salvation, as in the sight of God—that the scriptures, though given by inspiration, are sufficiently plain and easy to be understood by any honest and diligent mind, so far as is necessary to make us wise unto salvation—and further, that they are able to make the man of God perfect, through faith in Christ. We are therein told, that it were easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the Law to fail; that, if we would enter into life, we must keep the commandments; that whosoever offendeth in one point, is guilty of all; and that, if any one shall break the least of God's commandments, and teach men so, the same shall be least in the kingdom of Heaven.

In



In opposition to these unquestioned Apostolical traditions, as well as to other declarations in scripture equally clear and express, the Romanists daringly and unwarrantably urge the supremacy of their Bishop; that the word of God is a dead letter, a leaden rule, unintelligible to the laity, and of no more authority than Æsop's Fables, unless interpreted in that sense which their church arbitrarily imposes: and if they thus presumptuously set aside the written word itself, together with the authority of him who is therein declared to be the head of the corner, who can wonder at their rejecting other things which are expressly delivered in these scriptures?

They cautiously omit the second Commandment of the Decalogue from most of their catechisms and manuals, as they have made it of none effect by their image-worship; for the establishment of which, *oral tradition* was first alledged in proof of matters of faith by the second Council of Nice towards the close of the eighth century; that Council expressly anathematizing all those who do not receive ecclesiastical traditions, written or unwritten. The express words of our Saviour Christ, in his institution of the Holy Sacrament of his Blood, where he plainly says, *Drink ye all of this*, are, in the  
the

the usage of the church of Rome, become of no validity, as the people are deprived of the cup. In consequence of that implicit human faith required by the leaders of that communion from their votaries; faith in God, divine faith, becomes, to all religious purposes, as useless and ineffectual as the doctrine of repentance and good works is likely to prove with those, amongst whom confessions, bodily penances, and judicial absolutions are substituted in the place of actual renovation of mind and real amendment of life and manners.

Nor are we more at a loss in producing instances of such traditions as the Romanists declare to be Apostolical, though not to be met with either in scripture, or in any writings of the first ages of the church.

They have added to the canonical books of scripture those of the Apocrypha; which, as being written after prophecy and divine inspiration ceased, were not received among those oracles of God which were committed to the Jewish church; neither were they received by the Christian church in the early and purer ages of the Gospel. The Council of Laodicea, in the 4th century, set down a catalogue of the canonical books of scripture in a different manner from what is done by the Romanists. The Council of Trent expressly mentions Tobit,

Tobit, Judith, the Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the two Books of Maccabees, and a new part of Esther and Daniel; and declares concerning these whole books, with all their parts, that whosoever rejects them as not canonical, is accursed.

In like manner they deliver it as an Apostolical tradition, that the Roman church is the mother and mistress of all other churches; and that, without believing the things she declares, there is no salvation.

It is observed, that there are above an hundred anathemas (or curses) in the Council of Trent, against such as do not believe points of doctrine there laid down, though none of them are to be found in scripture.

Offering the sacrifice of the *Mass* for the souls in *Purgatory*, is a tradition they profess to have from Christ and his Apostles. So also are their mystical benedictions; their incensing, garments, chrism, wax-lights, and many other things which have no manner of foundation in any Apostolical writings.

Are these then the faithful men to whom an implicit faith must be yielded? How much safer is it to follow the rule of the Apostle, *Prove all things; hold fast that which is good!*

Thus

Thus the Fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries, even those for whom the Papists profess a special veneration, urge all Christians to attend to the scriptures, looking upon all that is not agreeable thereto as adulterate.

Many passages there are in St. Chrysostom and St. Austin often referred to on this head. St. Basil, whose authority is much used by the Romanists to enforce oral traditions, hath nevertheless one remarkable passage, which shews how he would have them judged of: "It is necessary (says he) for those that are young in religion to learn the scriptures, that the mind may be well confirmed in piety, and that they may not be accustomed to *human traditions*." And St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose catechetical discourses were published about sixteen years after the Council of Trent, says, "It becometh us not to deliver the very least thing of the holy mysteries of faith without the holy scripture. That is the security of our faith, not which is from our own inventions, but from demonstration of the holy scripture."

That this was not an unnecessary intimation, may be readily proved by producing a specimen of some traditions of the Romish church, which are expressly contrary.



contrary to scripture, and prohibited by the word of God.

Of this kind is the worshipping of God by images, in defiance of the second Commandment, and to the guard set upon it by a particular explication at the time when it was given—*ye shall not make with me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold.*

So also the worship of Angels and Saints, notwithstanding an Angel's saying upon such an occasion, *See thou do it not*; and an Apostle's dislike of the prostration of Cornelius, *Stand up, I myself am also a man*; and though such voluntary humility is condemned in the worshipping of Angels, which is no better than *an intruding into things unseen, and being vainly puffed up by a fleshly mind.*

The blasphemous adorations of the Virgin Mary are a most shameful contradiction to the scripture-rule of worship; and considering the stress laid upon this in the Roman church, it deserves to be particularly exposed. But I shall here only produce one instance more, by which the whole practice of godliness and virtue is destroyed; and that is their tradition as to works of supererogation, upon which the practice of granting indulgences is founded. This is against the express words of our Saviour—

Saviour—*When ye have done all these things which are commanded you, say we are unprofitable servants*; and against the evident sense and meaning of St. Paul's declaration in the 2d chap. of his Epistle to the Ephesians, where, describing our natural state, as aliens from God, and the inestimable benefits of which we are partakers through Christ, he adds, *Through him we both have an access by one spirit unto the Father*. And indeed this darling hypothesis of the Roman church may be justly said to oppose the whole tenour of the Gospel, and the Apostolical writings. And yet this overplus of good works, the merit of mere human performances, the church of Rome impiously pretends to reserve, as a fund, or treasure in her custody, according to the 21st session of the Trent Council; and this treasure is to be disposed of as the Church sees fit. The practice of granting indulgences for sin on this pretence is still more to be abhorred by all who believe the words of the Apostle, that *without holiness no man shall see the Lord*, when we recollect that *Cardinal Hosius*, the Pope's Legate at the Council of Trent, hath taught that the doctrine of their church is the express word of God, and whatever is taught against the sense and consent of the church is the express word of

of the Devil. Whence no considerate and unprejudiced person can forbear concluding that this traditionary spirit is that very spirit which works in the children of disobedience.

I hasten in the last placeto say something briefly of those traditions which have their institution wholly from the church, and are therefore called Ecclesiastical; in which Papists are as notorious for contradicting themselves, as for their contradictions to scripture.

Some of their writers acknowledge that the doctrines of transubstantiation, of the seven sacraments, and of purgatory, and the like, are not to be found in scripture; but others earnestly contend that they are to be proved from thence: and in their explanations of these points, as well as in their ways of arguing about them, they have uttered the most inconsistent things; not only contradicting each other, but the same writer contradicting himself; and upon the whole, destroying the credit of the very doctrines they would enforce by the grossest affronts to reason and common-sense. In proof of this, one or two instances may suffice.

St. Chrysostom tells us plainly, that Christ did not command us to imitate his fast, but to learn of him to be humble and meek.

meek in heart ; yet the church of Rome insists that a stated fast of forty days before Easter is founded on an Apostolical tradition : which is likewise clearly disproved by Irenæus in his account, so early as the second century ; and it is no less certain that the manner of keeping Lent has ever greatly differed in the Latin church ; so that all those ways could not be Apostolical.

Socrates, for instance, tells us that in the 4th century the church of Rome observed a fast of three weeks, whilst at the same time the church of Illyricum and Alexandria fasted six weeks. In the same place he informs us, that they differed no less in their manner of eating, than in their days of abstinence. Some would eat no animal food, others only fish ; some eat fowls with fish, some only bread ; whilst others, at night, eat all kinds of meat without distinction. Romish tradition again acquaints us of the immaculate conception ; that the Blessed Virgin was conceived without sin ; and on this account, at the latter end of the 15th century, the Pope appointed the festival of her conception to be observed on the 8th of December. Nevertheless, Aquinas, their own angelical doctor, affirms expressly that she was conceived in original sin ; and St. Bernard very sharply reproves the cathedral



dral church of Lyons for observing that festival, calling that their practice *the novelty of presumption, the mother of rashness, the sister of superstition, and the daughter of levity*. And to close the whole with what passed in the Council of Trent with respect to traditions, Anthony Marinier, one of their own divines, opposed their establishment, as part of the rule of faith in this unanswerable manner: "If (said he) you establish the absolute necessity of traditions, you must either affirm that God forbid the Apostles to write the whole revealed word, which you cannot prove; or else that the Prophets and Apostles wrote their books by accident, without any design to give us a compleat system of revealed truth in writing; which would be injurious to Providence, that presided both over their conduct and their pens." And lastly, should the Romanists urge this trite objection, that we receive the scriptures themselves only from the church's tradition, we answer, it is not so; since for this we have the additional testimony of heathens and apostates, who bear witness to the authenticity of those writings, even whilst they strive to oppose them: to which may be added, that the single tradition of the church of Rome is far from being our only warrant; and

and it is easy to discern the difference between the delivering down a written book which has been in the hands of millions of the laity as well as clergy, and the handing down certain private doctrines delivered to one set of men, who might corrupt them at their leisure. The Old Testament was delivered down by the Jews, which the Romanists receive and allow, whilst they reject other manifold traditions in the Jewish Talmud. Our case then is parallel with respect to them. Luther, the great reformer, it is well known, was condemned by the Pope for affirming that it was not in the power of the church or Pope to appoint new articles of faith; and the errors and corruptions then complained of not being defensible by scripture, several attempts were made to place tradition on an equal foot with the written word, as the only secure way. In consequence of which it was inserted, as one of the canons of a provincial council in 1527, that to receive nothing but what is deduced from scripture is a pernicious error. Upon authority of no earlier date than this, the Council of Trent was brought to establish it as a necessary part of the constitution of the Roman church, that their traditions should be received as of equal authority with the scriptures themselves.

Thus

Thus tradition contradicts tradition, and the Papists become now as inconsistent with themselves, ~~as with~~ the scriptures. Upon this principle every new council may begin a new set of traditions; and by thus opposing and forsaking scripture, the learned as well as the unlearned are led into endless mazes, and the most dishonest arts; while the bulk of mankind, the laity in common life, are subject to perpetual tyranny, and to have fresh yokes of bondage upon them in every age. The surest way, therefore, to avoid being imposed upon, as a late writer on this subject justly observes, is, to treat *oral tradition* as a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted knowledge and veracity.

The truth of the very circumstance of St. Peter's ever having been at Rome, supposing that would justify the exorbitant claims of the Papal Hierarchy, is solely grounded upon tradition. The scriptures alledge nothing in favour of the reality of that fact, but intimate much to the contrary; as I hope to prove in a subsequent lecture, and shall therefore only add here, what it greatly concerns the Papists to observe, in the words of their favourite writer, Bellarmine—

“ The

“ The right of the Pope’s succession to  
 “ Peter is founded on this—that Peter,  
 “ the Lord so commanding, placed his  
 “ seat at Rome, and sat there till his  
 “ death.”

May we not then justly say of those that  
 return to Popery, as the Apostle says of  
 the foolish Galatians, *Who bath bewitched*  
*them, that they should not obey the truth ? to*  
*suffer so many or so great things in vain* (as  
 in these nations we have formerly suffered)  
*if it yet be in vain.* But of you, my Pro-  
 testant Brethren, we hope better things,  
 and things that accompany Salvation. The  
 Bible only contains the religion of Pro-  
 testants; and after the most impartial search  
 of the true way to eternal happiness, we  
 shall find no rest for the sole of our foot,  
 but upon this rock only.

When we take a survey of the doctrines  
 and decrees of the Church of Rome, we  
 plainly see that there are Popes against  
 Popes, Councils against Councils: we even  
 find some Fathers against others; the same  
 Fathers against themselves; a consent of Fa-  
 thers of one age, against a consent of Fathers  
 in another age. Traditive interpretations  
 of Scripture are pretended; but there are  
 few or none to be found; nor is there any  
 sufficient certainty, but of Scripture only,  
 for any considering man to build upon.

C

God



God does not, and therefore men ought not to require any more of us than this—To believe the Scripture to be God's word, to endeavour to inform ourselves of the true sense of it, and to practise what we have learnt.

To conclude then; whenever you are speaking with tenderness and charity of the multitude of deluded souls that are under the Roman yoke, let that very compassion toward the persons of individuals excite your just abhorrence of Popery in general, which hath so vilely abused and enslaved humble and honest minds; nor are any of that communion to be flattered, by allowing that Salvation is to be obtained, any further than as they believe and obey the Gospel.

Be careful, when you fall into conversation with them on the head of tradition, that you watch against their subtilty in quoting places of Scripture, which speak of traditions before the Canon of scripture was completed; and in citing the Fathers for the tradition of Scripture itself, or of things declared and proved from thence, and then applying these things to enforce their ecclesiastical demands and decisions.

Neglect not to read the Scriptures, and to engage those about you so to do; lest the  
the

the free use of the Bible in your own tongue should prove, in the end, a privilege and a blessing, which may hereafter rise up in judgment against you.

Watch against infidelity and immorality, and whatever else may tend to disgrace the followers of God's word; remembering how great advantage is given to the unscriptural practices of the Romanists, by your departing from the Scripture, as a rule either of faith or manners. And finally, let the Scripture be made the great bond of peace and union among Protestants.

In things expressly declared, and necessary to Salvation, let us firmly and unanimously abide; in things deduced from Scripture by fair and just consequences, let us leave every one to judge, as accountable to God, and to his own conscience; and in things disputable and difficult to be understood, let us proceed with care, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, and maintain charity, allowing for different sentiments and opinions. And lastly, since we glory in the notion of our Reformed Church, it behoves us to apply to ourselves the moral lesson suggested by that character; namely, our obligation to a greater purity and holiness of life.

Without this, we dishonour our holy profession, and are actually involved in the same censure, which we apply to our adversaries; according to the declaration made by our Saviour to his disciples—*Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.*

LEC.

## LECTURE II.

II COR. I. 24.

*Not for that we have Dominion over  
your Faith, but are Helpers of your  
Joy; for by Faith ye stand.*

**I**T hath ever been accounted good policy in the Church of Rome to withhold the Scriptures from the laity, as well as to perform the worship of Almighty God in a language unknown to the people. A religion founded on the infallible judgment of one man, and requiring of all the rest of mankind an absolute submission to his dictates, ought not, it seems, to be examined; for should the people emerge from their credulity, and rise into reason and faith, the bold Pretender to infallibility would inevitably fall from the pinnacle of pontifical dignity into a gulf of universal contempt.

C 3

Thus



Thus readily may we account for the conduct of the ministers and stewards of the mysteries of that corrupt communion in this respect; nor is light more opposite to darkness, than this their practice must be allowed to be, by every unprejudiced person, to that plain and strict injunction of our Saviour to his followers, *Search the scriptures*: no mention is made of traditions, but only *the Scriptures*; for in them, says he, *ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me*. And it is as fully evident from what is urged elsewhere by the same divine authority, that it is in the power of every honest unprejudiced person, who is desirous of fulfilling his Maker's will, to inform himself of all truths necessary to be learnt, without the help of an infallible interpreter. Our Saviour plainly declares, *If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God*.

In contradiction to this, the Roman clergy alledge that the laity cannot understand the true sense of Scripture without their help, and that from them only they must receive and learn their religion.

Our Saviour elsewhere demands of his hearers in general, *Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?* Because you cannot, say the Romish ecclesiastics to the laity, without our assistance and direction.

rection. Your senses are not to be depended upon; they are under our guidance; and you are to believe what contradicts them all, your reason as well as your senses, even Transubstantiation itself, upon pain of eternal perdition.

Thus amply verified is that of our Saviour, *Many false Prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many:* and that of St. Peter, *There shall be false teachers among you, who shall privily bring in damnable heresies.* St. Paul not only tells us in general, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, but instances in particular doctrines; as *forbidding to marry*, and commanding to abstain from meats; the avowed injunctions of the Church of Rome.

Happily for us, my brethren, and in defiance of such arrogant claims and pretensions, that wise and vigorous set of men, the Protestant Reformers, broke open the Papal cabinet, exposed the pretended title of his Holiness to public view, and did all in their power to simplify religion, and reduce it to its original plainness and purity. They laid open the inspired writings; they taught the right of private judgment; and they summoned all mankind to enter into that *liberty with which Christ had made them free*; therein acting in exact compli-

ante with the sense of St. Paul's declaration to his Corinthian converts; *Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy; for by faith ye stand.* On the contrary, the church of Rome is charged with tyrannically usurping that dominion over the faith of Christians, which the Apostle here so expressly disclaims, as appears from the second additional article of the Trent creed, which runs thus; "I also  
 " receive the holy Scriptures according to  
 " that sense, which the holy Mother Church  
 " (to whom it belongs to judge of the  
 " true sense and interpretation of holy  
 " Scripture) did and doth hold; nor will I  
 " ever take and interpret it otherwise,  
 " than according to the unanimous con-  
 " sent of the Fathers."

It is to be further observed, that this same pretended Council of Trent made a decree, that none of the laity should presume to read the Bible, with or without an interpreter, unless by a special licence from a Bishop or Inquisitor; and that same liberty of obtaining any such licence being taken away soon after by two succeeding Popes, the question now remains, whether the people are to be totally deprived of the use of their Bible, that book being prohibited ever since by the Church of Rome.

The

The arguments I mean to adduce in vindication of this unalienable right of every man are these—The ancient usage of the Jewish and Christian churches, together with the general consent and approbation of the primitive Fathers; to which may be added the use and necessity of perusing the Scriptures: after which I shall take notice of the real motives, as well as the pretended reasons for the contrary practice in the church of Rome.

The people of God under the Mosaic dispensation were not only permitted, but commanded, to peruse and study the words of the Law, and to wear them on their foreheads, and to write them on their door-posts, that they might be in their remembrance continually; and this injunction was given, not to the Priests and Levites in particular, but to the whole of the people promiscuously. *These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up; and thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes; and thou shalt write them up on the posts of thy house, and on thy gates.*



The same we may learn from those words of our Saviour in St. John's Gospel, which I have already mentioned, whether we consider them as a relation of what was the constant practice among the Jews, or as a precept directing them to their duty—*Search the Scriptures*: which words were spoken to the Jews in general, without excepting the laity even in common life, which in reality comprehends the bulk of mankind; all are commanded to consult these oracles of God.

Shall it then be thought that the Christian church is not as much concerned as the Jewish, to look into that sacred volume; especially since the addition of the Evangelical and Apostolical writings? Is not every man now concerned to inform himself of the truths of the Gospel? Is not Christ, as well as Moses, to be understood by us? Is it not as necessary for Christians to read the Gospel, as for the Jews to read the Law? Or will any one presume to say, that the whole canon of Scripture, the entire word of God, ought not to be exposed to the view of all Christians, indifferently, as much as a part of it? This no candid and considerate person will offer to assert.

Again, it is evident that the Scriptures were common to all Christians immediately after the establishment of the Gospel. The  
men

men of Berea were commended as more noble than those of Thessalonica, because they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so. They not only received the word preached by St. Paul; but they read and searched the written word to satisfy themselves, that what the Apostle delivered was agreeable to what they found there. So the same Apostle tells the Corinthian Christians, that he writes no other things unto them than what, in perusing the Old Testament, as well as his Epistles, they would find to have been said before. *We have*, saith another Apostle, *a more sure word of prophecy whereunto ye do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place;* where St. Peter commends those to whom he writes, for attending to the writings of the Old Testament, and that they left them not to be studied by the clergy only.

How widely then do those differ from St. Peter, whilst they pretend to derive their authority from him in particular, who prohibit the use of the Scriptures to the people! What the practice of the primitive Christians was in this respect, we may gather from that Apostolical exhortation—*Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom. Let all holy Scripture, but more especially the Evangelical writings,*

be continually read and studied by you, that thereby you may gain divine and heavenly wisdom.

This, doubtless, is implied in that injunction—*Prove all things*; that is, try and examine them by the Scriptures; which is fitly joined with the foregoing verse, *Despise not prophesyings*; avail yourselves of all opportunities of having the Scriptures expounded and applied; for this is the surest method of arriving at true wisdom.

Seeing, therefore, that the perusal and studying of the Scriptures was thus constantly recommended and practised at the first planting of the Christian church, immediately after the promulgation of the Gospel; who can deny, with any shew of reason, that it is still commendable, and fit to be observed, in the propagating and preserving of it? To all this let me further add, that the use and general benefit of the Scriptures is an undeniable proof of the necessity of their being often and diligently perused by all who have an interest in them. *Whatsoever things were written aforetime*, by the inspired Penmen, *were written for our learning*. Whatever prophecies, doctrines, precepts; whatever promises or threatnings are contained in that covenant between God and man; they are all some way serviceable to our instruction and edifi-

edification, and ought therefore to be attended to by every one according to his ability: wherefore the Apostle thus addresses Timothy—*Continue* thou in the things which thou hast learnt from the holy Scriptures, and hast been assured of by the same spirit that wrote those Scriptures, knowing of whom, namely, of the Spirit speaking in the Scripture, thou hast learnt them; and that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto Salvation. And to explain this, he adds, *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness*; which terms may justly be said to comprehend all that is serviceable to our salvation and happiness. So that from these very instructions we learn the pious practice of the holy men and women of old in the Church of God, of instructing their very children in the Scriptures; while at the same time we are informed of the infinite use and advantage of being constantly exercised in them; they being able to make us savingly wise, as they are highly profitable to all spiritual ends and purposes. Upon considering all these things, will not any intelligent and unprejudiced person immediately conclude that the Scriptures are intended for the perusal



perusal of all, without exception, and that it is the highest degree of sacrilege in any man, or body of men, to attempt to debar the people of the use of those writings, either directly or indirectly; either by prohibiting their publication, by false translations or interpretations of them, or arrogantly reserving to themselves the sole right of interpreting them?

In this article of the Trent Creed, which we are now considering, every Papist declares that he will never take or interpret the Scriptures *otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*

To this it has been properly answered, that things necessary to Salvation may be learnt in Scripture, by those who cannot read the Fathers: and it may likewise be demanded, in case it is found that the Fathers are unanimous in opposing the doctrines and injunctions of the present Church of Rome, which way are its votaries to direct their attention, who have engaged to submit to the decision of both? What opinion the primitive Fathers held concerning the general and free perusal of the Scriptures, sufficiently appears from innumerable passages in their writings, of which it may be thought requisite to alledge some few instances, in order to confirm what I have already intimated.

Socra-

Socrates, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and our own countryman Bede, agree in telling us that the Scriptures were formerly translated into the languages of those respective countries where they were received, that they might be *read*, and *heard*, and *understood of the people*. Chrysostom repeatedly calls upon his hearers, laity as well as others, to furnish themselves with Bibles, and to consult them continually. "Whoever, says he, profess themselves Christians, let them peruse the Scriptures; for besides the holy Scriptures, there can be no true proof of Christianity."

So that if we may place any dependence on the judgment of this venerable Father, the Christian Church is to receive its authority from the Scriptures alone, and not the Scriptures from the Church, by which the Romanists mean their own clergy, as a distinct and independent body.

But to shew that Chrysostom is not singular in recommending the perusal of the Scriptures, let us attend to what the renowned St. Austin delivers on this subject. "The Scriptures," says this primitive writer, "are so profound, that I could profess to fit daily therein, though my sole business, study, and application, were to learn them from my childhood to an old decrepit age; in which there is such a  
" hidden

" hidden depth of wisdom, that what the  
 " Scripture itself does in some place of it  
 " witness, when a man has finished all,  
 " he then begins, the same thing those  
 " find by experience who are the most vi-  
 " gorous, penetrating, and desirous to  
 " learn. What disputations, what sciences  
 " of the philosophers, what laws of the  
 " best-constituted cities, are fit to be com-  
 " pared with those two precepts respecting  
 " the love of God and our neighbour,  
 " upon which our Saviour says the whole  
 " Law and the Prophets depend? The  
 " words of them are full of natural philo-  
 " sophy; for all the causes of all natures  
 " are included in God, the first cause.  
 " They contain moral philosophy; for a  
 " good and honest life can be formed upon  
 " no other principles than by loving the  
 " things which we ought to love, and in  
 " the manner that they ought to be loved  
 " by us; namely, God and our neigh-  
 " bour. They are logick; for God alone  
 " is the truth and light of the rational  
 " soul. They are also the precepts of  
 " wholesome polity; for a city has no  
 " safeguard so strong as the common ties  
 " of faith and firm concord, when all love  
 " the common good, namely, God, who  
 " is the chiefest good." To speak thus of  
 the Scripture, is doubtless to acquaint us  
 that

that men of the greatest abilities shall still be able to perfect their knowledge, and daily meet with fresh subjects, both worthy of, and above their theory; while others, who are less qualified for sublime and exalted speculations, may follow a more easy path, which is marked out all along with plain, but necessary and useful precepts relative to practice; whereby, in other words, he recommends the sacred writings equally to all people.

Of the same opinion is Isidore as to the benefits arising from a general and free perusal of the Bible; and Hugo de St. Victor, who is called another St. Austin, thus metaphorically delivers his judgment—

“ In the refectory, or banqueting-room of  
 “ the holy Scriptures, there are three ta-  
 “ bles laid; namely, the three different  
 “ senses in which they are to be received  
 “ and regarded; the historical, the mysti-  
 “ cal, and the moral: the first is for the  
 “ less learned, the second for teachers, and  
 “ the third for both. Some stomachs are  
 “ for grosser meats; and to these, miracles  
 “ and examples are adapted: some feed  
 “ altogether upon dainties; to whom al-  
 “ lusions, mysteries, and figures, are more  
 “ acceptable: and lastly, some meats  
 “ agree with all appetites; of this sort are  
 “ the



“ the precepts and instructions appertain-  
 “ ing to life and manners.”

But to produce one irrefragable proof that the Church of Rome has not been always uniform and unanimous in condemning the general use of the Scriptures, I shall close this head in appealing to the decision of Pope Gregory, surnamed the Great—“ Read frequently the holy Scriptures: yea, let the lessons of the holy Scriptures never go out of your hands, which alone (says this Pope) will teach thee the will of God. Some things (continued he) are forbidden therein, some things are commanded, some things are allowed, others advised. The holy Scriptures are a mirror held before the eyes of the soul, to the end that we may contemplate the face of our inward man, wherein we discover whatever is deformed, or whatever is beautiful; both our improvements and our failings are discerned.”

Those who are conversant with the writings of the ancient Fathers, will be ready to allow that this is with them a favourite topick: it would therefore be highly absurd in those writers to speak so largely in commendation of the general use of the Scriptures, did they suppose there could be any impropriety in their being  
 read

read or heard in the vulgar languages. On the contrary, they took great pains themselves to translate the Bible, and to render it as intelligible as possible to all, especially in necessary points of belief. So evident is it (if there be any weight in antiquity and authority) that the Scriptures ought to be delivered into the hands of the people.

But the Church of Rome hath some seeming reasons for the contrary practice; and these I am now to examine.

In the first place, it is too good for the laity: the Bible is holy, and therefore not fit for dogs and swine; for that such is the estimation in which the bulk of the people are held by the Roman clergy is evident from hence, that their most approved writers, in order to justify their withholding the Scriptures from the people, alledge those words of our Saviour—*Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine.*

How holy, then, must be that Church, where, by their own account, its members, that is, by far the greater part of them, are to be placed on a level with the vilest animals!

Let our reasoning, my brethren, and our inferences, be of another sort; and if it be true that the people are in general unholy, they have, on that very account,  
more

more need of that book which will discover this their state to them, and lead them into the ways of righteousness and true holiness.

It has been further objected, that the Scriptures are obscure, and hard to be understood, and therefore of no use to common readers.

Much might be replied to this argument, as it is, at best, but judging of the whole from particular parts. But as no one ever pretended that the holy Scriptures are equally intelligible throughout, it should satisfy any man, that whatever is necessary to be known is sufficiently intelligible.

To fear God and keep his commandments, is the summary of the Old Testament: to repent and believe that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is the compendium of the New. Whoever can prove his obedience and faith by these plain duties, fulfills the Law and the Gospel. It was doubtless most agreeable to the infinite goodness and tender mercies of God, to make every thing which he requires of us weak mortals, obvious and clear. The importance of the duty implies its certainty, which is not to be found in phrases either doubtful or obscure. The Scriptures are justly styled the Revealed Will of God; they  
are

are addressed to all mankind, and given to remain as a rule of faith and manners to the end of the world. It must therefore follow, that whatever is necessary to be known in them is to be as easy and intelligible at one time as another, and to all men alike. The Creator and Preserver of mankind cannot take delight in perplexing his creatures with darkness and ambiguities, and in points too where their salvation is at stake. He is not a rigid master who would reap where he did not sow. Such would be a cruel mockery; unworthy of the Divine Being, who hath brought life and immortality to light. Nothing is plainer than the Law and the Gospel. Whoever says the contrary, does no less than accuse the great and beneficent God, and justify wicked and wilful men, whom he has left without excuse, by telling them clearly what he expects from them. *What does the Lord require of thee, O man, but to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?* Thus said the Lord in times of old by the mouth of one of his Prophets; nor is there any difficulty in understanding this.

In the New Testament we are told the grace of God, that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live  
soberly,



*soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.* The same Apostle tells us elsewhere, *If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye, through the spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.* On this subject he is his own commentator in another place, where he thus fully explains his meaning; *Now the works of the flesh* (says he) *are manifest, which are these—Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.* On the contrary, says he, *The fruit of the spirit is, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.*

All this is so plain and intelligible, that whoever offends against any of these injunctions must be without excuse, as he offends against conviction.

A certain Ruler once asked our Saviour what he should do to inherit eternal life: at another time a certain Lawyer proposed the same question. To both of these our Lord's reply was of a similar signification: without asking what sect or persuasion they were of, or by whose interpretation they

they had construed the sense of the Scriptures, which he supposed were free to the inspection of all men; to one he said, *What is written in the Law? how readeſt thou?* To the other, *Thou knoweſt the commandments.*

Whoever then goes about to obtrude his own construction upon any part of Scripture, whether plain or doubtful, and enjoins others to abide by his interpretation, does not demand submission to the word of God, but to his own authority and imagination. The things which Christ spoke and did whilst he was on earth, are the subject of the Gospels; and if they were understood at that time by the persons to whom they were delivered, there is the same, if not greater reason to conclude they will be understood now, since many things there spoken of have been since accomplished.

As for the Epistles which the Apostles wrote to the churches for their direction, why may not Christians in these days receive equal, indeed, greater benefit from those writings, since the fulfilling of several passages therein mentioned must have thrown still stronger light upon them; witness St. Paul's foretelling the grand defection in the Western Church, where none can be at a loss to discern to whom he alludes, when he says, in the *latter days some shall*

*shall depart from the faith, abstaining from meats, forbidding to marry, &c.* nor to mention the multiplicity of expositions, commentaries, and annotations, which, as helps to the unlearned, many pious and intelligent men have put forth upon the Apostolical writings?

If then whatever is necessary to salvation is sufficiently intelligible to every capacity, let no man presume to excuse himself for neglecting to attend to those precepts and instructions relative to life and manners, and which concern his future and present welfare; since these are said to be so plain and intelligible, that he who runs may read them; because the same writings contain other things dark and difficult to be understood, and which, for aught we know, for the unseen purposes of an all-wise Providence, are designedly wrapt up in mysteries.

Thus much for the plea of obscurity in Scripture. But still, say the Romanists, the free use of the Bible amongst the laity is frequently the cause of errors and heresies.

This argument against the use of any thing, merely from the abuse of it, if it proves any thing, must prove by far too much. With an equal shew of reason might it be alledged that eating should be prohibited, because it is known that  
many

many have died by excess. But to keep closer to the subject in hand; this argument would prove that preaching should be suppressed; that learning of every kind, especially that which is called divine, as it relates to religious and spiritual matters, should be totally abolished, and the Bible, as the most dangerous and pernicious of all books, should be entirely secreted from the sight of all men, particularly from the clergy; since it is well known that many promoters of error and heresy in past times have been ecclesiastics. Arius, Pelagius, Photinus, Macedonius, Marcion, Nestorius, were church-men; to omit many more amongst the Romanists, who have shamefully perverted the Scripture, to support their own unwarrantable claims and innovations, in such a manner, that any reader of a moderate capacity, if allowed to judge for himself, must despise their palpable absurdity. To make good this charge, I shall mention some particular texts, as interpreted by the Lovain Divines, as specimens of such illogical inferences as they are capable of advancing.

In the Prophecy of Isaiah it is said, that *the axe may not boast itself against him that beweth therewith*—therefore, they say, no man ought to judge the Pope, though he  
D should



should draw innumerable souls with him to Hell.

Our Saviour commanded Peter to take money out of the fish's mouth, and *pay*, says he, *for me and thee*—therefore the Pope is the head of the church.

God made *the Sun to rule the day*, and the *Moon to rule the night*.—This, likewise, under the refinement of Roman casuistry, affords a piece of information beyond the investigation of an ordinary capacity; for what honest plain-dealing Christian, with the help of his own understanding only, could have ever found out that under this mystery it is implied, that the Pope is above the Emperor?

*The earth is the Lord's, the round world and all that dwell therein*.—Here, behold, we are taught that the sacramental bread ought to be round!

Lastly, our Lord's Disciples said, *Behold, here are two swords*; therefore, be it known to all men, that both the spiritual and temporal power are in the Pope.

To pass over many material corruptions and interpolations of Sacred writ, with which the Romanists are evidently chargeable, it being well known that they have changed the word *repentance* for *penance*; construing what originally meant an act of the mind, into a mere bodily performance, which  
avails

vails nothing, and that they have unwarrantably foisted in many of their own tenets and observances into Scripture; such as Purgatory by *name*, the sacrifice of the Mass, Pilgrimage, &c. which are not to be found in any former editions, still less in the original manuscripts. I shall only mention one circumstance which must appear altogether irreconcilable to any Roman-Catholic, who would wish to adhere to the interpretation of Scripture as laid down by his own teachers. Pope Sixtus V. published an edition of the bible, consigning all to eternal perdition who should henceforward presume to receive it in any other sense than that wherein he had set it forth. Within two years, Pope Clement, looking upon himself, in his turn, as equally infallible, and sole judge of controversies, published another edition of the Scriptures, differing from the former in numberless instances of omission, interpolation, and direct contrariety of sense; which performance he confirmed in opposition to that of his predecessor, with the same denunciations of Divine and Apostolical vengeance in this world, and in the next, against all who should refuse to give his work the preference.

Unless, therefore, the Papal Infallibility is really such that two Pontiffs can differ

even in the most material points of religion as much as light and darkness, and yet both be in the right, a stretch of infallibility beyond even the reach of omnipotence, which never yet could be supposed to act a contradiction; unless, I say, this be allowed, where is a pious, devout, and well-meaning Romanist to apply for the interpretation of the Church, should he unfortunately have met with both these explications of his faith? Of such validity are the specious pretences of which the Romish clergy would avail themselves, in appearance, to justify their withholding the Scriptures from the people. But these being in reality no other than specious pretences, I shall conclude with assigning the true and only reason for their procedure in this respect. Ignorance (say the Romish clergy) is the mother of devotion. It is, indeed, the parent, the grand source and chief support of that devotion to the priests, that blind, implicit, and unreserved obedience to their dictates, by means of which they maintain such an undue and unwarrantable dominion over the faith, the senses, and the souls of their votaries, that it is with them a crime of no trivial magnitude to allow the slightest doubt to take place in their minds; to admit, but for a moment, the least shadow  
of

of conjecture, as to the propriety of the injunctions of their Church, or their authority to impose them.

This may serve as an answer to that popular and natural question, why so many intelligent and learned men remain in so corrupt a communion. In temporal affairs they act, we see, as rationally, and with the same prudent caution as other men, because they are then permitted to think for themselves; but in matters of a religious nature they are forbid to enquire or hesitate: and where it is heresy to think, or to attempt to inform themselves, how can they do otherwise than remain in worse than Egyptian darkness?

This remark stands amply justified in those authentic accounts which have been frequently afforded us of the motives which induced many members of the Roman Church to desert her Communion. They were of the number of those happy few, in comparison, who venture to enquire into, and examine the arguments on both sides; and so far from being tempted to take that step from a fondness of separation, their conviction has been the result of an enquiry at first undertaken for a very different end; namely, that of justifying the dictates and observances of their own sect.

—See Archibald Bower's account of his



own Conversion, in the beginning of his preface to his Life of the Popes; or as quoted at the conclusion of the Eleventh Lecture.

From such examples we may learn that nothing tends more to the subversion of superstition, and corruption of every kind, in affairs of a religious nature, than a free and rational enquiry into the reason and grounds of that faith which we profess; and that, on the other hand, we may readily perceive the design of the Rulers in the Church of Rome in concealing as much as possible from the eyes of the people the plain Gospel truths, and obtruding, in their stead, their own false comments, arrogant decrees, and absurd traditions. Accordingly, one of their own communion, Peter Sutor by name, freely and plainly owns why the Scriptures are not to be read in the vulgar tongues—"Because," says he, "when the people see that things are required by the Church of Rome to be done by them, as if they were of Apostolical command, and yet cannot find a word of them in Scripture, they will be inclined to murmur."

The Bible then, it seems, must by any means whatever be kept carefully from the people, that they may not discern the impositions, frauds, and misconduct of the Roman

Roman Church. Though the Ten Commandments are in appearance set before them, yet must this be only in appearance. The last must be divided into two, to conceal the fallacy of withdrawing the second, as that plainly condemns the practice of bowing to images as utterly unlawful, and in the highest degree offensive to the honour of the Almighty, who on that occasion declares himself a jealous God, and will not suffer his glory to be given to another.

The Papists therefore fear the light of Scripture, and fly from it; as Tertullian said of the Heretics of his time; and as our Blessed Saviour had said before him of evil men, that *bate the light, neither come to the light, lest their deeds should be reprov'd*; lest the people should be tempted to oppose the unjust usurpations of that corrupt Church, to cast off the yoke which hath so long lain upon them, and repossess themselves of that liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free.

Thus have I endeavoured to vindicate the right of private judgement in matters of faith and salvation, which should ever remain unalienable; and shall now close the whole with this short reflection.—

As the Scriptures, my Brethren, contain the whole Revealed Will of God, they

ought not to be less esteemed or attended to because you are allowed the free use of them; nor are you to look upon those writings as of less intrinsic worth, because, in consequence of the happy Reformation, ten Bibles may now be purchased for what was the ordinary price of one English chapter of the New Testament before the commencement of that æra.

Be truly thankful then that you are not confined to Roman services, nor to divine service in Roman language;—that you can hear with edification, read with advantage, and pray with understanding.—Make the best use of these great and singular benefits, of which your neighbours of another Communion cannot boast.—Let your knowledge in divine matters be proportionable to the advantages you are possessed of; and above all, let your lives and practices be in conformity to your attainments.

*Let your conversation be as becometh the Gospel of Christ.*

LECTURE

## LECTURE III.

I. COR. IV. 1, 2.

*Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ and Stewards of the mysteries of God. Moreover it is required in Stewards that a man be found faithful.*

**T**O put our trust in God only, and to the observances of his own appointment and sanctification, is so essential a duty incumbent on us, that whoever places his confidence in any thing but God, is evidently a violator of the first Commandment: and in like manner, he that adopts instrumental supports of his own invention, that men may place a subordinate ministerial dependence upon them, does no less than usurp the prerogative of the Almighty, and acts in opposition to the interests of true religion, whose very essence and formality is to do good to man, to advance the



honour of Christ's kingdom, and to glorify God in all his attributes.

“ With regard to the holy and divine  
 “ mysteries of our faith or religion (saith  
 “ St. Cyril) we ought to deliver nothing  
 “ hastily, or without the authority of the  
 “ sacred Scriptures.” How notoriously  
 the Church of Rome has prevaricated in  
 respect to this great soul of religion, ap-  
 pears by evident demonstration. Without  
 a divine warrant they have invented, as it  
 were, sacramental mysteries of their own,  
 to which they presumptuously impute spi-  
 ritual and heavenly effects; promising, not  
 only temporal benedictions and immuni-  
 ties, but the gift and increase of spiritual  
 graces, together with the remission of sins,  
 and even eternal life and salvation to those  
 who shall use them. These, because God  
 did neither institute nor sanctify, their de-  
 luded votaries apply without faith, and  
 rely upon, without a promise; making  
 themselves the fountains of these graces,  
 and assuming confidences, whose last resort  
 is not upon God, who neither authorised  
 nor approved such superstitious usages.

Of this nature are holy water, the Pas-  
 chal wax, oil, palm-boughs, holy bread,  
 agnus-dei's, consecrated swords and medals,  
 baptised bells, and hallowed roses—all  
 and each of these receiving their supposed  
 intrinsic

intrinsic and supernatural virtue by passing through the hands of men, of whose own personal sanctity there is often too much reason to doubt. But to hasten to the subject in hand, there are instances of notorious breach of trust still more flagrant than those already adduced, with which the Ministers of the Church of Rome, as Stewards of the Divine Mysteries, are evidently chargeable—I mean their abuse of the two Sacraments, strictly and properly so called, and the addition of five more to the number; which five have not in them the nature of Sacraments, nor were they of divine institution as such; and consequently are so far of superstitious and human invention, and supported for the ends of worldly interest. These were contrived in the twelfth century by Peter Lombard, Master of the Sentences; so called because he collected what he thought the finest sentences out of the writings of the Fathers. They were afterwards defined by the Council of Florence, in their instructions to the Armenians, in the year 1438, as an article of faith, and confirmed in the Council of Trent. Though even at that time some of their Divines were of a contrary opinion, yet their judgment was over-ruled by the major part, who resolved to shew no favour to the Lutherans, and

therefore determined that there should be seven sacraments of the new law; which determination, for want of more substantial arguments, was supported by the following reasons. The number of seven, say they, is mysterious, prophetical, and perfect: Naaman was commanded to wash seven times; the altar must be cleansed seven days; Job offered seven bullocks and seven rams; and in like manner we read, in the Book of Revelation, of seven churches, seven angels, seven stars, seven candlesticks, seven thunders, seven seals, seven books, seven trumpets, and the like. These allusions are taken particular notice of by the Rhemish annotators; nor are they thought too trivial to be adopted even by Cardinal Bellarmine himself, that learned champion for the Roman cause, whose name in the course of these Lectures I have frequent occasion to mention.

But as we are no where authorised by Scripture to apply these mystical allusions to the Sacraments of the Christian covenant, so does the manifest inconsistency of that pretended analogy evidently appear from this single circumstance; namely, that matrimony cannot be a Sacrament of the New Covenant, since it was ordained in the time of man's innocence. But as any chimæras, when supported by such authority

rity as that which has too long been usurped  
 by the Roman Church, will pass for sound  
 arguments, those inventors of mysteries  
 might, if they had chose, have ascertained  
 the real number of the Christian Sacra-  
 ments from similar allusions mentioned in  
 Scripture ; namely, two great lights in the  
 heavens, two tables of the law, two che-  
 rubim, two swords, two witnesses, and,  
 what is still more, two testaments.

But seven, it seems, was to be the num-  
 ber at all events ; and accordingly it was so  
 decreed by the Trent Council, and framed  
 into an article of faith in the new Roman  
 Creed, being the third in order, if we pass  
 over the twelve first, which constitute the  
 Nicene Creed, which we receive and  
 acknowledge.

The words of this article are these——

“ I do also profess that there are truly  
 “ and properly seven sacraments of the  
 “ new Law instituted by our Lord Jesus  
 “ Christ, and are necessary to the salva-  
 “ tion of mankind (although all the Sa-  
 “ craments are not necessary to every per-  
 “ son) namely, Baptism, Confirmation,  
 “ the Lord’s Supper, Penance, Extreme  
 “ Unction, Orders, and Matrimony. All  
 “ which do confer grace ; and whereof  
 “ baptism, confirmation, and orders, can-  
 “ not be repeated without sacrilege. I do  
 “ also



“ also receive and admit all the received  
 “ and approved rites of the Catholic  
 “ Church in the solemn administration of  
 “ the aforesaid Sacraments.”

By the same Council of *Trent*, or Western Conventicle of Italian Bishops, which confirmed these articles, it was likewise decreed that whoever shall say that any of the seven is not truly and properly a Sacrament, is accursed.

This we are not to wonder at ; since in the Councils of the Latin Church the usual appendage to every decree is an execration. But they cannot curse those whom God hath not cursed ; and that this decision is highly arrogant, and altogether unwarrantable, will readily appear from a brief and cursory view of the subject before us.

As error is ever apt to run into extremes, the Papists are notoriously guilty in this respect, as they have both added to, and diminished from, the true Sacraments of Christ. To the water of baptism they have added oil, salt, and spittle ; the two last of these being evidently of heathen invention, and long since made use of in the rites of Pagan worship. Not satisfied with that form of words which our Saviour enjoined, for the solemn admission of members into his Church, these modern inventors of ceremonies have multiplied  
 their

their exorcisms and incantations, attended with numberless ceremonials of white garments, lighted candles, &c. to a degree of superstition altogether unknown and unheard of in primitive times.

In the Sacrament of the Eucharist they have flown to the opposite extreme, by refusing to the people the participation of one half of that Ordinance as literally commanded by our Saviour—*Drink ye all of this: this cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of Me.* This subject I shall have occasion to discuss more at large in the consideration of a subsequent article, and shall therefore proceed to justify the heavy imputation laid upon the Church of Rome by all Reformed Christians, of daringly augmenting the number of the Sacraments of the New Covenant by the addition of five more. Before I undertake to examine each of those Sacraments peculiar to the Roman Church, it will be absolutely necessary to premise one caution with regard to the word Sacrament; namely, the essential difference between the Sacraments of the Christian Church, and those ceremonials, rites, observances, types, emblems, or indeed sometimes mere analogous resemblances in things pertaining to religion, which pious men of old have dignified  
with

with the name of Sacraments, as meaning no more than things sacred. Numberless instances to this purpose might be named; fasting and prayer, vows of celibacy, washing the disciples' feet, and even weeping, have, in the general and unrestrained sense of the word, been called Sacraments by some Father or other; so that, were this to be the true and only criterion by which the nature of them is to be ascertained, the Papists would stand chargeable with diminishing, instead of increasing the number of the Christian Sacraments, which in that case might amount in number not to seven only, but to seventy times seven. A dispensation by no means compatible with the boasted liberty of the Gospel, relieved as we are declared to be by the founder of our religion, from the burdensome ceremonies of the Jewish Law. But for Sacraments truly so called, what the word properly signifies, and when taken in that sense in which the Romanists themselves intend it should be understood, we can find no more, either in Scripture or in the writings of the ancient Fathers, than those *two*; namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. What else could St. Cyprian mean when he tells us that men may be thoroughly sanctified, and become the children of God, if we be regenerate  
with

with *both* the Sacraments? And St. Austin says, "Our Lord Jesus Christ hath knit Christians together with Sacraments which are most few in number, most easy to be observed, most excellent in signification; and these are Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These are the *two* Sacraments of the Church." If we consult the writings of the Apostles, St. Paul thus expresses himself: *By one spirit we are all baptised into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one spirit.* As if he had said, that it was the design of both those Sacraments which our Lord appointed in the Church, to unite all Christians, by means of the spirit, to Christ Jesus, and to each other, and so to make one body; which explanation may suffice for a plain declaration of one article of our Creed—I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church.

In order, then, that we may avoid all strife about mere terms and phrases, and keep clear of all misconceptions which might arise from the general and extensive signification in which the word has been used of old by various writers, we shall do well to keep in mind the true and adequate definition of a Sacrament of the Christian Covenant, in which both sides  
are



are agreed.—The Trent Catechism, tho' it was not drawn up till after their Decrees and Anathemas were published, declares that a Sacrament is a sensible thing, which by divine institution hath a power, not only of signifying, but of causing holiness and righteousness. This definition agreeing in substance with that in our own Catechism, it appears by the acknowledgment of the Papists, as well as that of our Church, that three things are requisite to constitute a Sacrament, viz. That there be an outward visible sign—that it confer a sanctifying grace on the partakers—and that it be of divine institution.

I am now to examine the proofs which the Romanists urge in favour of each of their five pretended Sacraments.

The first which we reject as a Sacrament, and which by them is placed the second in order, is Confirmation.

As an Apostolical ceremony, this is retained and observed in our Church; and especially, since the universal practice of Infant Baptism, it is doubtless highly reasonable, not to say necessary, that those who gave no actual consent of their own, should come, and by their personal and express act, make the stipulations of Baptism: and there is no doubt but those who thus seriously and devoutly renew their  
baptismal

baptismal covenant, will be favoured with a proportionate effusion of God's grace and holy spirit. For all this we have sufficient warrant in Scripture; and a thing so good in itself, that has at least a probable authority for it, and was confessedly a practice of the earliest times of the Gospel, is accordingly upon very just grounds continued with us. It were well if it were as seriously and devoutly attended to as it is lawfully established.

But still, with regard to this observance, there is no express institution either by Christ or his Apostles; no rule laid down for the practice of it; there is no matter made use of as an external visible sign (the laying on of hands being no more than a gesture in prayer); nor are there any additional federal rights annexed to it; since it amounts to no more than a confirmation of a former covenant, and from thence derives its denomination. On these accounts we declare it to be no Sacrament.

But the stewards of the mysteries of the Church of Rome have, according to their usual dexterity when in want of expedients, amply supplied all these defects. If we have recourse to the Roman Catechism for the definition of Confirmation as a Sacrament, and more especially to Pope Eugenius's instructions to the Armenians in the Council

Council of Florence, we find this description of it; that it is an unction with chrism upon the forehead in the form of a cross by the hands of a Bishop, by which the person confirmed doth receive strengthening Grace from Christ the author of it. This account we have from their most authentic writings; but the Council of Trent, liberal indeed as to decrees and execrations, has nevertheless been altogether deficient in ascertaining the nature of this pretended Sacrament, any further than in declaring that the matter, or external sign of it, is chrism, or unction. In this their own description of it, then, we have all the requisites of a true and proper Sacrament. For the divine institution of it, and the grace conveyed by it, we have their bare words, as I hope to prove hereafter; whilst, as to the remaining essentials of so sacred an ordinance, they have displayed their usual fertility of invention. Their form of administering is in these words—"I sign thee with the sign of the  
 " cross, and confirm thee with the chrism  
 " of Salvation, in the name of the Father,  
 " and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

The ceremonies usually accompanying this form of words, are these:—The Bishop breathes upon the pot, or cruze, which contains the chrism, or ointment, with  
 which

which the person is to be marked in the forehead; he adores it in these words—Hail, holy chrism! kisses it, and then strikes the person on the cheek, to teach him patience; whose forehead is bound about, lest the chrism should run down; teaching him, by a token singularly edifying, to beware of losing the Grace of God; on which account, likewise, his head is not to be washed for seven days.

This chrism or ointment, it is to be observed, is a mixture of oil of olives and balm, (Opobalsamum); the oil to signify the clearness of a good conscience, and the balm, the favour of a good reputation. That the very ingredients of this composition are of themselves spurious, we have the greatest reason to conclude, from what is said by Pliny, who was justly celebrated for his curious researches into nature. He says that the balm which grew but in two places in Judea, had perished in his time: And as it was long since a complaint amongst the Eastern Christians, that the true balm could not be obtained in such quantity as might suffice for the yearly renewal of it, (which it seems was thought requisite) still less probable is it that any should be found in western countries; and if so, the people are evidently abused. Be this as it will, we not only condemn some  
of



of these ceremonies which I have already mentioned as frivolous, and inconsistent with that rule of doing all things decently and in order, which the Apostle literally recommends. Such is the striking on the cheek; a practice borrowed from the manumission of slaves in times of Heathenism, and which custom was afterwards abrogated as absurd and insolent by the Imperial law; we not only abhor their adoration of the chrism, as direct idolatry; we not only despise their unchristian practice of returning to those weak and beggarly elements which the Apostle strictly forbids our having recourse to, as though we neither knew, nor were known of God; and of adopting and enjoining ceremonies and observations no less burdensome than those of old, prescribed by that law which was but a shadow of good things to come, which law is now abolished, as those good things we are told, are come: but we are able to prove, with respect to this particular custom of using the chrism, or ointment, in Confirmation, however it may seem to be countenanced by ancient usage, is of a far later date than the times of the Apostles, or their immediate successors.

In this case let the decision of the Council of Mentz, (cap. 18.) for the present suffice, which runs thus:—"The Sacrament

"of

“ of Confirmation in the beginning was  
 “ exhibited only with laying-on of hands:  
 “ for whereas the Holy Spirit then, for  
 “ the more evident confirmation of faith,  
 “ did appear by evident signs in those  
 “ that were confirmed, there was no need  
 “ then of outward anointing.” To this  
 may be added, that, according to the  
 charge of Chemnitius against Bellarmine,  
 since the use of the chrism, the Romanists  
 have thrown aside the chief and most essen-  
 tial ceremony of Confirmation; namely,  
 that of laying on of hands, which on all  
 sides is allowed to be primitive and Aposto-  
 lical.

The use of chrism as the outward visible  
 sign, which is to constitute one material  
 part of the Sacrament of Confirmation,  
 Bellarmine thus attempts to justify from  
 Scripture, II. Cor. 1. 21, 22. *Now he  
 which establisheth us with you in Christ, and  
 hath anointed us, is God, who hath also  
 sealed us, and given the earnest of the spirit in  
 our hearts.*

The Jesuit supposes, what he cannot  
 prove, that an allusion is here made to the  
 anointing in Confirmation.

The text is not serviceable for any such  
 purpose; the whole purport of it being  
 that God had given his Holy Spirit, which  
 is metaphorically called the unction from  
 above,

above, to those Disciples, to strengthen and confirm them in all holiness.

His other place is 1. John, ii. 27. *But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you; and ye need not that any man teach you. But as the same anointing teacheth you all things, and is truth, and is no lie; and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.* This text falling in so directly with the other, needs but a word to answer it. Nothing is more plain than that by anointing, here, is meant the Holy Spirit of God, which is said to abide in them, to teach them, and to be truth itself. Can any of these things be affirmed of oil or balsam? does it abide in the faithful inwardly? does oil teach them all things? or is it truth itself? To such trifling are we reduced in answer to such trivial arguments, the palpable futility of which it is plain that Bellarmine himself was aware of, since we find that within a very few chapters he has recourse to another expedient for proving an outward visible sign in Confirmation: he there declares it to be the imposition of hands; which if he could prove, there would then be two visible signs for one Sacrament, or he must be allowed to contradict the decision of his own Church, but more particularly what he literally asserts in his own writings on this subject,

subject, where he calls it sacrilege to change even the matter of Sacraments; and that, as he very justly observes, for this reason, because, says he, the Sacraments are the causes of grace; and no one can give grace but God; and therefore no one else can appoint the essentials of Sacraments. Notwithstanding this, we find that the Council of Mentz declares, that the Sacrament of Confirmation in the beginning was exhibited only with laying on of hands, whilst the Trent Council, and the Roman catechism assert that chrism is the matter or sign of this Sacrament; and the instructions of Pope Eugenius expressly inform us that the chrism, or unction, is now given in the Church instead of that imposition of hands mentioned in Acts viii. 17.

Thus much for the pretended visible sign in this Sacrament.

As to the next essential, namely, the promise of Divine Grace, the same writer alledges the following passages of Scripture. John xiv. 16. *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.* John xv. 26. Where the Comforter is said to be sent to testify of Christ, John xvi. 8. *When he (the Comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.* Luke xxiv. 49. *Tarry ye in the*  
E
city



*city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high. And lastly, Acts i. 8. Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me, &c.*

Here is, indeed, a promise of Christ to his Disciples (who were troubled to hear of his departure from them) of his sending the Holy Spirit to be their comforter, their guide, assistant, and supporter. This promise we find was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost: but this is far from affording us any proof of an inward, strengthening grace being annexed to Confirmation as a Sacrament. Could Cardinal Bellarmine have proved that it was by Confirmation that the Apostles received such extraordinary assistance of the blessed Spirit, his purpose might so far have been answered; but on the contrary, under his proofs, he immediately tells us that the Apostles, by a singular miracle and blessing, did receive the promised grace, without any medium, or Sacrament, on the day of Pentecost; and therefore certainly without the rite of Confirmation being administered. By the imposition of hands by the Apostles, we are told that many supernatural gifts were directly conferred, which manifested themselves in visible effects, insomuch that Simon the sorcerer was thereby tempted to offer

offer money, with a view to purchase the same extraordinary gifts; but supposing that, by the continuance of this Apostolical ceremony in the Church, the ordinary gift of sanctifying grace was certainly bestowed by the Ministers of God's word and Sacraments, and supposing that the observance of this rite, accompanied with that gesture which was used in primitive times, was still maintained in the Roman Church, (which it is not;) yet still, in order to constitute a Sacrament, the divine institution of it remains to be proved. To evade the force of this objection, as no passage in Scripture can be brought to support the assertion, Bellarmine contents himself with concluding, that the Apostles would not have used such imposition of hands, if they had not their Lord's command for it. A bare presumptive proof; a conclusion without premises, and what, in the language of disputants, is called Begging the question; for as to the rite of laying on of hands, the Apostles needed no more a command from our Saviour for the use of that gesture, than for kneeling at prayers; both the one and the other being the frequent and known practice among the Jews; and therefore, not having been prohibited, they required no further command for the use of them. Before then we can

grant to the Church of Rome, or to Bellarmine, their zealous champion, that Confirmation is a Sacrament, they must prove that it was instituted and ordained by Christ himself; which Bellarmine is not able to do: that it hath an outward visible sign appointed, and set apart for it; in the proving of which he fails likewise: and lastly, that it hath a power of conferring an inward sanctifying grace; which he is no more able to prove than either of the other essentials. But where Scripture fails to support their innovations, it is the uniform practice of the Romish disputants to have recourse to tradition, which they impiously denominate the unwritten word of God.

With regard to the subject in question, it would but occasion a tedious recital of the names of polemical divines, chiefly of the Roman persuasion, were I to undertake a display of the uncertainty of tradition, and of the contradictory accounts which are delivered down by it of the same thing.

That subject having been already discussed more at large in the first of these lectures, I shall here content myself with observing, that Sirmondus produces from St. Ambrose a different form of words as anciently used in Confirmation; and from  
thence

thence concludes that the present form is of later date; confessing at the same time, that both the matter and form of this Sacrament are changed; in consequence of which the Sacrament itself must be changed, and then the Church must be a very unfair keeper of tradition.

I shall close this head with the following remarks.

The rite of Confirmation we allow to be federal and primitive; but then, as the chrism, or composition of the ointment, introduced by Popery, was unknown in the first times, the Apostles and Presbyters using oil only in their miraculous cures of the body; so even the laying on of hands in this ceremony (though Apostolical, and continued in succeeding ages, and therefore justly retained in our Church) has no claim to be dignified with the high title of a Sacrament, as not being distinguished by any privilege or divine favour annexed to it. The Apostles by their imposition of hands conferred miraculous gifts, the effusion of which has long since ceased in the Christian world; and the kindly communications of the Holy Spirit ordinarily promised to believers, whether of comfort or assistance, are doubtless to be gained by prayer, and more especially by a worthy participation of the Lord's Supper. Confirmation, therefore, is not a new Sacrament,



ment, but (as some speak) the ratification of baptism; as far at least as regards our part of the covenant; the piously disposed catechumen now beginning to perform in person what was before stipulated by proxy. And were the candidates for Confirmation duly qualified with religious principles, and their minds worked up into a sincere and devout frame, how happy a crisis might it prove of entering upon the Christian life! Who more likely to run, with resolute perseverance, the race that is set before him, than one who enters upon it in so solemn a manner, and after having so strongly plighted his faith? Upon such holy exercises we may reasonably hope for the divine blessing, tho' not in a sacramental, yet in an efficacious way.

In treating of the Sacrament of penance, as it is called by the Romanists, we are to be aware of misconceptions which may arise from an abuse in the Rhemish translation of the New Testament. The original Greek word, *μετανοια*, is known to signify a change or renovation of mind, and is therefore properly termed repentance, in our language, and not penance, which is a mere bodily act, and may possibly be exercised by hypocrites, impenitent persons, and even infidels themselves. From our Saviour's severe charge against phari-  
saical

saical pretenders to extraordinary piety; the world has long since been informed that outward cleanliness, and even the most singular appearances of austerity and mortification, are far from constituting any certain indications of inward purity, or contrition of heart and mind; and the emblem of a painted sepulchre is altogether applicable to men of that character, who are uncommonly precise, and even rigorous in the external observances of religious acts, whilst (to use the Psalmist's phrase) their inward parts are very wickedness.

To proceed then; we acknowledge that repentance is so necessary a condition of the New Covenant, that without it we can have no assurance of salvation. It consists of several acts, which being joined together, when they have produced a real inward change, we become true penitents, and may claim that *remission of sins*, which in the New Testament is often joined with *repentance*, and is its certain consequent. The chief acts of repentance are, confession to God for our sins more immediately against Him; acknowledgment of our offences to our brethren likewise, if any hath aught against us, not forgetting to make restitution and satisfaction, to the uttermost of our power, for any wrongs done by us to any other,

as we ourselves would have forgiveness of our offences at God's hand. This our Church avowedly enjoins; and further recommends private confession to a Minister of God's word, when the penitent is discomposed by any pressing anxiety of mind arising from religious doubts. Nor do we deny that due and adequate submission ought to be made to that body, or Church, to which we belong, in case we are conscious that such public offence has, at any time, been given by us, as may seem to demand it. To forward more effectually this great work of inward repentance and reformation, it were well if the penitent would pay such regard to those important duties of religion, alms, prayer, and fasting, as his health and circumstances will admit, and his case may seem to require. But in this, as in private applications for spiritual counsel and advice, men are in a great measure left to their own discretion.

The great design of repentance is, to change our tempers, and reform our lives, that we may be the children of God without rebuke; pure as he is pure, perfect as our Father which is in Heaven is perfect. Upon such a repentance, sincerely begun, and honestly pursued, the Ministers of the Gospel, as heralds of God's mercy, are indisputably

indisputably authorised to declare to the people, the gracious offers of pardon by Christ Jesus. This is our doctrine concerning repentance: but notwithstanding our agreement thus far, we cannot join with the Church of Rome in making either repentance, or penance, a Sacrament of the New Covenant. We find here no characters of a Sacrament, any more than in prayer or ordinary devotion. Here is no matter, no application of that matter by a peculiar form, no divine institution. The scene is in the mind; the acts are internal, the effect is such also; and therefore we do not account it a Sacrament, not finding in it any of the characters of so sacred an ordinance.

The Papists say that penance, as they wish to have it called, is a true and proper Sacrament, instituted for reconciling the faithful unto God, when fallen into grosser sins after baptism.

The external part of this Sacrament they absurdly place in three things; the contrition of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the satisfaction of some good works, enjoined by a priest when he gives them absolution; which, according to them, is not merely declarative, but judicial and authoritative; so that the Priest himself does truly and really pardon their sins.



But as this doctrine of theirs is supported by very weak arguments, (the whole depending on so flagrant a misconstruction of the original text as amounts to little less than a forgery) so is it contrary to Scripture, and highly pernicious to the souls of men. The necessity of confessing to a Priest, in order to absolution, is without any warrant from Scripture: contrition of the heart is not visible to men, while the confession of the mouth may be false and deceitful: the making satisfaction, if it be meant as to God, is absurd and blasphemous, since in Christ alone we have propitiation for our sins; if as to man, it is indeed a fruit and evidence of inward repentance, but can no way come under the notion of a sacramental rite or action. Neither can priestly absolution be the form of penance, as a Sacrament; because, as it is used in the Church of Rome, it is a mere usurpation: the Priest, not being endowed with the gift of discerning of spirits, cannot possibly know whether the penitent be sincere; nor has he power to absolve him otherwise than by declaring the promises of God to the truly penitent; not by authoritative remission; for, as they cannot curse whom God hath not cursed, so neither can they forgive whom God hath not forgiven. No less vain and indefensible is that plea  
which

which the Papists urge in favour of their pretended Sacrament of the anointing dying persons, which they have distinguished with the name of Extreme Unction; an appellation utterly unknown in the Christian Church, till, like that of Transubstantiation, it was coined by the Romanists. Unction, or anointing, it is true, as I have already observed, was, for miraculous purposes, enjoined by our Saviour and his Apostles, so long as the power of curing the sick, by preternatural means, was continued to the Church. The Greeks, in compliance with that primitive usage, still maintain the practice of unction, or anointing the sick, though that practice is now become vain and useless, as it is evident that those miraculous gifts of healing have long ceased. But still this custom in the Greek Church being apparently an attempt to confer the same blessings which were of old conferred on the bodies of the sick, through the same means which were at first enjoined, and afterwards practised; this custom, I say, though now become fruitless and unnecessary, is certainly innocent, especially when compared with the Popish ceremony of extreme unction. The Greeks observed unction, but not extreme unction; they would willingly, if possible, cure the sick by those means which the Apostles

E 6

used,

used, and restore the infirm to life and health; that the sinner might have leisure, by his future conduct, to atone, as well as he was able, for all other sins which he had committed, besides those particular crimes which were supposed to have been the cause of his sickness, and which were at that time evidently forgiven, as the sickness itself was removed.

Thus our Saviour himself argued with the Scribes, when he restored the paralytic;—*That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins; (then he said to the sick of the palsy) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house.* He had before said unto him, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee; after which gracious sentence of pardon, the divine vengeance no longer rested upon the sinner; the cure was no longer delayed than was necessary to convince the unbelieving Scribes, that Christ's mission was from above.

The unction, therefore, which is said to be practised by the Greek Church, even were that Church a rule to us, affords no countenance to that anointing which the Papists call extreme unction; as it is applied for purposes altogether foreign to the original intention of that Apostolical unction and benediction which was used at the first promulgation of the Gospel, at a  
time

time when its ministers were evidently endowed with such miraculous powers, as were thought requisite to assist and countenance them in the arduous undertaking of inculcating a new doctrine of grace and reconciliation, through faith and repentance unto good works, to a stubborn and rebellious people—to a world immersed in sensuality, in darkness, and in sin.

Thus we find the Apostles (Mark, vi. 13.) and the Presbyters in the first ages of the Church (St. James, v. 14, 15.) in their miraculous cures using oil as a symbol of that figurative unction conferred on them by the Holy Ghost, in virtue of which they received that grant of supernatural power.

But then the divine favours which accompanied that operation, were not so much the graces of the mind, as the health of the body; and so far as sin had been the occasion of their sickness, their sin was pardoned.

The passages of Scripture to which I allude, and upon which alone the Papists build their Sacrament of extreme unction, are these—*They cast out many Devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.* The words of St. James are as follow :—*Is any sick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray*



*pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him..* Thus said Jesus to the blind man whom he had restored to sight, *Thy faith hath saved thee.*

How little countenance these texts of Scripture afford to the practice of extreme unction, with the Romanists, and that as a Sacrament, is evident to the most superficial observer; the whole nature and design, as well as the circumstances of the ceremony, is changed. Instead of restoring the sick to health, it is used as a pass-port for the dying; and that never till life is despaired of. Not content with barely touching the patient with oil, in resemblance of that simplicity of ceremony which our Saviour once exhibited, when he touched the eyes of the blind with clay, they anoint the organs of each sense, supposed to be polluted by sin; to which the Council of Florence has added the anointing of the reins and feet, which Bellarmine says is not necessary; so that it is evident that in this they are not at unity in themselves.

Cardinal Cajetan confesses that from this text of St. James, the Sacrament of extreme unction cannot be collected either  
by

by words, or by the effects. Hugo, Peter Lombard, Bonaventure, Halensis, and Altisidorus denied that this Sacrament was instituted by Christ; from whence, by plain consequence, it follows, says Suarez, that it is no true Sacrament.

That of Holy Orders comes next to be considered; with regard to which we affirm that Christ appointed a succession of pastors, in different ranks, to be continued in his Church for the work of the Gospel, and the care of souls; and that, as the Apostles settled the Churches, they appointed the three different orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: and we further believe, that all who are dedicated to serve in these ministeries, after they are found worthy of them, ought to be separated to them, by the imposition of hands, and by prayer.

These were the only rites in use, for many ages of the Church: nor in this designation of particular persons to any holy function can we possibly discover the characters of a true Sacrament of the Christian Covenant. It is evidently not of general use to all Christians; there was no outward visible sign, or matter annexed to this ordinance, till about the eleventh century, when the delivering of the vessels of the altar to the candidate, was invented as a substitute

substitute for that deficiency : unless with  
 Bellarmine (who herein once more con-  
 tradicts the decrees of his Church) we al-  
 low the imposition of hands, as well in the  
 Sacrament of Orders, as in Confirmation, to  
 be the external matter or sign. This sub-  
 terfuge the Cardinal found it necessary to  
 have recourse to, for the same reason as  
 that already mentioned under the head of  
 Confirmation ; namely, that the external  
 matter, or visible sign which the Church of  
 Rome had annexed to that Sacrament, was  
 not to be proved from Scripture. The  
 gifts bestowed by Apostolical Ordination  
 in the first ages of Christianity, were mi-  
 raculous, and lasted no longer than the  
 necessities of the Church seemed to require;  
 and whatever communications of God's  
 grace, and holy Spirit, might be presumed  
 to have been conveyed to the immediate  
 successors of Christ and his Apostles, it  
 appears, from what was intimated by one  
 of his chosen ministers, that, even in those  
 days, it was possible, while he preached to  
 others, that he himself might be a cast-  
 away. Our Lord, it is true, at the same  
 time that he sealed to the Apostles their  
 sacred commission, qualified them by his  
 holy Spirit for the discharge of their va-  
 rious and important offices ; and indeed  
 not the Apostles only, but the Priests and  
 Deacons

Deacons seemed, by a kind of creation, to have been inspired with new souls, and faculties more than human.

An eloquent fluency in all languages was at once imparted; and the richest treasures of divine knowledge were poured out upon them; and their enlightened understandings could, undazzled, be entertained with clear views of the divinest mysteries.

Such were the Apostles, such the first Bishops and Pastors in the Church: but this golden age of Christianity is no more; their *prophecies* for many past centuries have *failed*; their *tongues have ceased*; their *knowledge is vanished away*. Theology is now an arduous science, of almost infinite extent; and it requires time, and no small pains, but cursorily to travel over its several parts. All the fountains of the sacred truths, and many of the prophane, must be drank of; the wells are deep, and with difficulty from thence we *draw the living water*.

But to proceed—Marriage is unquestionably of divine appointment, and honourable in all: but being of far earlier date than the Christian dispensation, namely, co-æval with the state of man's innocence, of consequence is still founded on the law of nature; and though the Gospel gives rules respecting the relative duties in this state  
of



of life, as it does concerning the duty of parents and children, a relation founded likewise on the same law of nature, yet is matrimony by no means to be dignified with the title of a Sacrament. We find in it no outward matter, no form instituted, nor, with respect to God, any federal acts; neither are there any effects of saving grace assigned to it. Those prayers and intercessions which are put up to Heaven at the celebration of marriage, are not part of the contract, but only fit and becoming circumstances of engaging in so lasting an obligation: for if it were true that religious ceremonies constituted a Sacrament of the Christian Covenant, according to the sense assigned by the Roman Church, as well as ours, then every compact between man and man, and more especially those between princes and subjects, might claim that venerable appellation; such engagements being generally sealed with concomitant oaths and abjurations; as, in ancient times, scarce any considerable treaty was transacted, but the victim bled, and other holy rites were performed at the solemn ratification.

With a view to make it appear that the essentials of a true Christian Sacrament are not wanting in this ordinance of matrimony, the Roman doctors, assign the inward

ward consent of the parties for the matter; while the form they make to be the words, or signs, by which this consent is declared.

This ill-grounded opinion, besides, (as we have already observed) that it makes all mutual compacts to be Sacraments, may, and often has produced many fatal consequences. Parties have often married against their wills, though at the time they profess an outward consent. If afterwards they find themselves happier in their choice than they expected, still they cannot suppose themselves lawfully united in the Sacrament of matrimony, if it were true that their inward consent was at first necessary to constitute the validity of it.

On the other hand, where discontent ensues, here is a foundation laid for dissolving marriages, as often as either of the parties will swear that they gave no inward consent. This is confirmed by facts, having often been practised at Rome. Though it has long been established, by decree in the Councils of that Church, that faith is not to be kept with a supposed heretic, yet every honest, unprejudiced person, who is not an abject dupe to the servile maxim of implicit submission to the authority and infallibility of the Roman Church, will readily acknowledge that all contracts are sacred things; that men's words, confirmed  
by:

by oaths and other solemn acts, must either be binding, according to the plain, obvious, and allowed sense of them, or all the security and confidence of mankind is destroyed; nor can any man, or body of men, be safe amongst those who hold such a doctrine, or so long as that decree remains upon record.

Further, to prove this Sacrament of marriage, Bellarmine reverses the syllogism; and instead of making it appear that marriage is a Sacrament, because it has all the essentials annexed to it, he concludes, that it must have those essentials because it is a Sacrament: this last assertion he grounds upon that passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; v. 32. *This is a great mystery.*

Sacraments, it is true, have been called mysteries, but it does not follow that all mysteries are Sacraments. In answer to this, we find that this text is, by the Romanists, thus translated in the vulgar, and English Doway versions of the New Testament, *This is a great Sacrament.* Though this is evidently a great abuse of language, it still is far from serving their turn; for St. Paul himself sufficiently confutes them in the very next words, where he manifestly declares that he did not intend to represent marriage itself as either a mystery or a Sacrament,

sacrament, as he alluded to a nobler subject; but I speak, says he, concerning Christ and his Church. In Christ, therefore, and his mystical body, was couched that mystery which the Romanists would confine to the ordinance of marriage.

Thus have I endeavoured, as briefly as the nature of the subject would allow, by exposing the futility of those arguments which the ablest Popish disputants have offered for the support of them, to vindicate the conduct of the Reformed Church in rejecting those five pretended Sacraments, which, though unknown in Christendom for upwards of eleven hundred years, have, since that time, been added to those two which are only generally necessary to Salvation, and which were given unto us, and ordained by Christ himself.

This may suffice to shew the impious presumption of the Romanists in multiplying the Sacraments. The arguments produced, being taken from Sacraments considered as arbitrary divine injunctions, prove that their virtue is not owing to their own physical efficacy, but to a supernatural blessing, according to the Almighty's good pleasure, annexed to their being duly administered and worthily partaken of. The institution ought, therefore, to be precisely and strictly observed;  
so



So that those who have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam, for the love of the wages of unrighteousness, would do well to take care, with him also, to say, *We cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord, to do either good or bad of our own minds.* Finally, my brethren, let us learn wisdom from their errors, by keeping close to the law and to the testimony; not daring to add to God's words, lest we be found lyars: for, *Blessed are they that bear the word of God and keep it.* Endeavour to maintain the purity of the Christian worship, and to adorn it with an holy conversation. Detest the Antichristian tyranny, and superstition, which have deformed the primitive religion of our Redeemer, and which are not from Heaven but of men, *earthly, sensual, &c.* Wait on God aright in the use of those Sacraments which you are sure are dignified with the divine sanction, and seek to, and depend on him, for a divine blessing from them.

## LECTURE IV.

EPHES. II. ver. 8, 9.

*By Grace ye are saved, through Faith ;  
and that not of yourselves, it is the  
gift of God. Not of works, lest any  
man should boast.*

THE doctrine of a sinner's justification before God, though of the greatest importance in the Christian Religion, is well known to have been deplorably misrepresented, obscured, and perverted, before the Reformation, by mistaken, or by crafty and designing teachers in the Church of Rome. Their doctrine of human satisfaction, and penances, has a tendency either to distress the consciences of awakened sinners, or to lay them asleep by dangerous opiates, instead of leading them to the blood of Christ, the only healing balm for a wounded spirit.

Ia

In my further consideration of this subject, I mean to pursue the following method: To explain the nature of man's justification, according to the doctrine of all reformed Churches, and according to that of the Church of Rome, since the Trent Council; the latter of which I hope to prove to be false and erroneous; dangerous to men's souls, and contrary to Scripture, to reason, and to the ancient and uniform tradition of the Catholic Church, before the assembling of that Council already mentioned; after which it will be no difficult task to evince the evil tendency of that doctrine, closing the whole with some suitable exhortations.

Justification by faith, then, is an act of God's goodness, whereby, for the sake of Christ's satisfaction to his justice, upon men's sincere belief of the Gospel, he accounts their faith for righteousness, pardons their sins, and acquits them in judgment. This is that plain account we find in Scripture of justification, as it relates to sinful man. This is evident from frequent passages in holy writ, as in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where we find the author thus expressing himself to the same purpose; *Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that, through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness*

*forgiveness of sins; and by him all that be-*  
*lieve are justified from all things, from*  
*which ye could not be justified by the law*  
*of Moses. And since no man can be justi-*  
 fied by the law of works, we are conse-  
 quently to seek for justification by the  
 Gospel, which requires faith in our Lord  
 Jesus Christ. Whoever would be justified  
 by the Law, as opposed to the Gospel, was  
 obliged to give an absolute and perfect  
 obedience to the Law; and as the Law  
 could not enable its followers to obey its  
 precepts perfectly, they could not, there-  
 fore, expect to be justified by it. By the  
 Law is the knowledge of sin; and conse-  
 quently it condemned, but could not  
 justify. Hence it is called the Minистра-  
 tion of Condemnation, and the Minистра-  
 tion of Death: for as *all have sinned, and*  
*come short of the glory of God*, so all would  
 be liable to the curse mentioned as the  
 consequence of transgression, were it not  
 that our justification, through the Gospel  
 Covenant, does not depend upon an abso-  
 lute, sinless obedience, but upon sincere  
 and unfeigned repentance, through faith  
 in the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus  
 Christ. But we must here observe, that  
 the Covenant of Grace is in the proposal of  
 it conditional; and that Christ, with all his  
 saving benefits, is, by the Gospel, offered



on terms which we stand personally obliged to perform. For this we have our Saviour's own words; he that believes shall be saved, and he that believes not shall be damned: and we find in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, when God first proposed the Covenant of Grace to Abraham, he annexed to it sincere obedience as the indispensable condition of it. Walk before me, and be thou upright; and I will make a Covenant with thee. Now, as the whole conditionality of the Gospel is comprised in that one word Faith, it greatly concerns us to be settled thoroughly in the notion of it. It appears, then, very evident, that to be justified by faith, in the Scripture sense, is to be justified upon the terms of Christianity, and the principles of the Gospel, in opposition to Legal and Jewish justification; and that by Faith is implied whatever the Gospel requires of us in order to justification. The Gospel is styled the Law of Faith; and whatever is required of us by it is called the Obedience of Faith.

We must, further, with great caution, avoid extremes in our conception of this Gospel faith; we must not think, on the one hand, that by Faith is meant only a bare assent to the Revelation of Jesus Christ, and an entire acquiescence therein; faith being never spoken of in Scripture as  
bare

bare believing and assenting, in opposition  
 to acting, but as the grand principle of  
 acting: nor are we to think on the other  
 hand, that the best of our performances are  
 any way conducive to it, only upon the  
 condition of the satisfaction made by Christ  
 to the divine justice for us. Justification,  
 therefore, does not exclude, or make void  
 the Law, so as to render good works unne-  
 cessary, but establishes the Law. The  
 doctrine of Justification by faith alone, may  
 indeed be so grossly misunderstood, as  
 thereby to render the Law useless. But our  
 holy religion allows no such doctrine, but  
 obliges us to acknowledge the necessity of  
 a holy life, and all manner of works of  
 piety, justice, and mercy: for, though  
 no doctrine is more expressly delivered in  
 the Gospel than that of justification by faith,  
 the sense of it must, nevertheless, be greatly  
 perverted, to conclude from thence that  
 Salvation may be obtained without good  
 works, which the Gospel enjoins as a ne-  
 cessary condition in order to Salvation:  
 for as without faith it is impossible to please  
 him, so *without holiness*, saith St. Paul, *no  
 man shall see the Lord.*

At the judgment of the Great Day, God  
 will have regard to men's works, to the  
 good or evil they have done; *God will  
 render to every man according to his works;*

and we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that we may receive according to what we have done. These seeming contradictions, therefore, may easily be reconciled, if, when the Scriptures say that faith is sufficient to Salvation, we understand by it that true faith which the Gospel requires, and which, the Scriptures inform us, produces an holy life, and discovers itself by all manner of good works. Such are the marks and characters which distinguish a saving, from a barren, hypocritical faith.

*What doth it profit, my brethren, faith St. James, though a man say he has faith, and have not works? Can faith save him? If faith has not works, it is dead, being alone.* The merits of our Redeemer are indeed all-sufficient, and the Gospel is to be looked upon as a covenant of mercy to them that believe and repent; but the benefits arising from thence, we must remember, are conditional; and unless we believe, and likewise do works meet for repentance, we not only are yet in our sins, but are many times more the children of wrath, than the heathens in their times of ignorance ever were. It evidently appears, therefore, that Christians are under as great an obligation to manifest their faith by good works, as to shew that they have any degree

gree of faith. But here again we are to remember; that though works are absolutely necessary, yet they in no wise merit our justification, being no more than a condition on our part, by which we are entitled to the merits of our Saviour: in this respect, therefore, all boasting is excluded; and it is enough that our faith in Christ, on our sincere obedience, is so far accepted by God, that he esteems us righteous thereupon. Should we argue from our justification by faith, that we are no longer under any obligation to do what is good and just, this would be endeavouring to overthrow the whole Gospel dispensation, and make religion a screen for the blackest impieties. The Gospel prescribes the same works with the Law, excepting the ceremonies. It obliges men to a greater holiness than the Law required, and enforces obedience with much stronger sanctions: and we may observe further, that the preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles began with exhortations to repentance; which would never have been the subject of their discourses, had Salvation been offered to mankind upon terms which needed no repentance; and that our Saviour, in his Sermon on the Mount, makes mention only of works,



which necessarily attend that faith, which, according to Scripture, justifies.

This is the true Scripture notion of man's justification, and final acceptance with God; and, as such, is received and acknowledged by all Reformed Christians: we allow that there is so indissoluble a connection between good works and that faith which justifies, that both are necessary as conditions of our Salvation; but we deny that either of these, together or separate, are, on our part, meritorious of present grace, or future glory.

On the contrary, the Council of Trent declares that the good works of justified persons do truly deserve eternal life; and, Can. xxxii. an anathema is denounced against him that denies them to be meritorious, or that a justified person by them doth truly merit increase of grace and happiness, and eternal life. Vega, who wrote his books of justification during the time that he was at the Council, maintains that the Council, by truly meriting, understood merit by *condignity*, and not by *congruity* alone; a distinction, in their barbarous scholastic language, by which they imply thus much.

Merit by congruity, they say, signifies a good work, which is worthy of a divine reward, not from any obligation of justice,  
but

but through a principle of fitness, or congruity, and from the free bounty of God. Merit by condignity is a good work to which reward is due from a principle of justice, as well because of the worth or dignity of the work, as because of the worth of the person that has done it. It is again evident, that this is the opinion of the Divines of the Church of Rome, as Bellarmine has determined; and Gregory de Valentia maintains it also for a certain point of faith. The Inquisition plainly declared it when it expunged, for heretical, out of several books of that Church, such propositions as denied the merit of good works. The same thing was also done by Cardinal Quiroga, in his Expurgatory Index which he composed according to the order of the Council of Trent.

The same spirit likewise appeared in the Divines of the Church of Rome, when they cautioned those of their communion to beware of the opinion of such ancient authors as opposed the merit of good works. This was done at Rome, in Spain, and in France, with respect to such authors as they could no longer suppress. Thus having, in numberless instances, made the word of God of none effect through their traditions, they have in the end made tradition itself of no validity, through their

own decrees and innovations. Such, it is evident, is the doctrine of the modern Church of Rome; and that every member of that communion is bound to receive and acknowledge that doctrine, appears, not only from that anathema which is denounced by the Trent Council against all who deny it, but likewise by its being made an article of faith in their Church.

The fourth article of the Trent Creed is this—

“ All and every thing which was declared and defined about original sin  
“ and justification by the most holy  
“ Council of Trent, I embrace and receive.”

What that Council has defined and declared relative to justification by good works, I have already shewn; and shall proceed to prove that their doctrine, in this point, is not consonant to Scripture, to reason, or to the uniform opinion of Catholic Divines before the Trent Council.

To begin with the first of these: How often are we told in Scripture, that *we are saved by grace, through faith, and that, not not of ourselves, it is the gift of God; that not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saves us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing*  
of

of the Holy Ghost. When the Apostle speaks of eternal life, as opposed to death, the change of expression is very remarkable. *The wages of sin is death, but eternal life is the gift of God through our Lord Jesus Christ:* and again, *Grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.* If our salvation be of grace, it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace; and if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise, work is no more work: not by works of righteousness, but of his mercy, he hath saved us. Tit. iii. 5.

The best of men, in Scripture, are represented as disclaiming all pretensions to merit, when they have to do with an holy and righteous God. Nehemiah was an excellent Governor, and did many things for the honour of God, and the good of his Church; yet he begs that God would spare him according to the greatness of his mercy. David, an holy and devout Prince, acknowledges, that *if God should be strict to mark iniquity, he could not stand before him*; and solaces himself with this thought, that *there is forgiveness with God, that he may be feared.* Again, he says, *Enter not into judgement with thy servant, O Lord, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.* Thus the holy Prophet Daniel confesses, *We do not present our supplications*  
F 5
before.



*before thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercies. Who can say I am pure from my sins?* says Solomon in his Proverbs.

In the New Testament our Saviour himself tells us *there is none good but one; that is God*: and St. Paul, who, after his conversion, was probably one of the best of men, speaks of himself as *the least of all Saints*; and owns that it was *by the grace of God* that he was what he was. When he *laboured more abundantly* than the rest of the Apostles, it *was not he, but the grace of God that was with him*. And in many things, says St. James, *we offend all*. Evident it is, then, beyond contradiction, that this cannot be the language of those who confide in their own personal merit. Those texts of Scripture, therefore, which the Romanists urge in defence of their doctrine of merits, we may be as sure cannot fairly admit of their interpretation, as we are sure that one part of Scripture does not contradict another. Is eternal life sometimes called a Reward? At another time it is called *the Gift of God*; and therefore must be a reward of grace. Is it styled a *Crown of righteousness*? That is owing to the purchase of Christ, and God's faithfulness to his promise, which is one branch of his justice and righteousness; still was it grace that made the promise of so great a reward.

When,

When, again, Saints are said to *walk with Christ, for they are worthy*; this worthiness is an evangelical, and not a legal one. It only denotes their qualification and meetness for the promised bliss, but does not imply a direct claim to it on the score of personal merit. These and many similar expressions in Holy Writ declare, indeed, the wisdom and honour, the grace and goodness, the free bounty and liberality of our merciful Creator, but not the merit of those who are thus highly favoured.

This will be further evident when we consider the reason of things. The following arguments may suffice.

None of the conditions and essential qualifications of merit are to be found in the best works of good men. What we do is a debt; it is short of what we owe: what we do is not our own; but *our sufficiency is of God*: neither, lastly, is there any proportion between our best performances, and that reward which God hath in reserve for those that love him.

With a view to a more ample illustration of this subject, I shall consider each of these arguments distinctly.—What we do is a debt.

True it is, that one creature may deserve of another; but how can it be said that the best of us can merit any thing at the hands

of our Creator, by way of commutative justice, since the service which we perform to God is but what is due to him? The Angels and Archangels, Seraphim and Cherubim, received their being, and all their excellencies from God; and on him they depend for the continuance of them: the greater these are, and the more glorious those works are which they find themselves capable of performing, the greater unquestionably must be their obligation, their honour, and their happiness. They are indebted to him, and not he to them. Accordingly, these holy and excellent Beings are represented in Scripture in the lowest postures of adoration; as veiling their faces before God's throne, and casting their crowns at his feet; ascribing blessing, and honour, and glory to his divine perfections, and not to their own deserts.

But it seems the perfection of a member of the Roman Church may be superior to that of Angels. He is not only capable of fulfilling his Maker's will, so as to cancel all obligations on his side; but, by doing more than is commanded, he is persuaded that he can make God his debtor; and by superfluity of good works, is often able to atone for the sins of others, as well as his own.

own. Their method of arguing on this subject is thus :—

If a Papist, for instance, marries a common prostitute, with a charitable design of converting her, that charitable act of his shall effectually cover the multitude of his own sins, and most probably of her's likewise: it is, they say, of itself a good work; and as it is a work no where commanded, it becomes a work of supererogation; and on that account so highly meritorious as to be an adequate atonement for the sins of more than one person.

Such is the avowed doctrine of the Romanists, as recorded in their own Decretals. Decret. l. ii. Tit. 12.

This may be readily accounted for, when we consider that the good works of men, in their account supposed meritorious, constitute an inexhaustible fund of merits which is in the Pope's keeping, and saleable only by him, under the titles of Indulgences, Dispensations, or Pardons. So easy is it, according to the maxims of that corrupt communion, for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of Heaven; whilst the retailers of these immunities have the assurance to declare, that they are indulgencies in which the poor can have no share. Thus the Jews of old distinguished men into three different ranks or orders; the



the impious, who transgressed the Law; the just and righteous, who perpetually kept the Law; and the holy or good men, who did more than the Law required of them, and supererogated: of this last sort were the Pharisees, of whom our Saviour has literally declared, that they are less justified, in their pretences to religion and piety, than the most sinful Publicans, who meekly acknowledge their own unworthiness.

If then the best of our services are due to God as a debt, so do they fall infinitely short of what we owe to our great Creator and Benefactor; and on that account, likewise, all boasting on our side is utterly excluded. Our debts to God we must be for ever paying, and shall always owe. There is that iniquity in our holy things, that sinful imperfection in our best performances, that even for these we should stand condemned at the bar of God's justice, should he be extreme to mark what is done amiss. Were it not for Christ's perfect and ample atonement, and prevalent intercession, there would be no hope of acceptance.

The righteous Law of God reaches to the thoughts and intentions of the heart; to the principles and ends, as well as to the matter of our actions; and therefore those

those are grossly ignorant of themselves and their own abilities, who flatter themselves that their best works are adequate to the purity, spirituality and extent of it. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength: this is the first and great Commandment.* Yet who among us can say, that he has fulfilled it as he ought? Numberless, indeed, are the defects of our best graces and duties; many are the iniquities of our holy things; and it will be difficult to point out the man, who has performed one religious duty without the mixture of some unbecoming ingredient, without the intrusion of some vain and idle thought.

All pretences, therefore, to Sinless Perfection, are the result of pride and ignorance. *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.* If we would feel the power of Gospel Truth, that is the religion of sinners; and supposes us, from first to last, to be frail and imperfect creatures. Sincerity of intention, integrity, or uprightness of heart and life, is the highest perfection we can hope to attain to; and it is our happiness that we are under such a dispensation of grace, as accepts of that sincerity in the room of legal perfection and un-  
sinning

sinning obedience, as the terms of our final pardon and acceptance.

But we are further to remember, that our best works are not our own, but our sufficiency is of God; and on this account, likewise, there can be no merit in them: not our works only, but that grace by which we are saved, that faith itself by which we are said to be justified, as the same Apostle tells us, Eph. ii. 8. *is the gift of God.*

There is in all men that proneness to sin and vice, that we need both preventing and assisting grace to do any thing that is spiritually good; so that all we have to boast of is our infirmities: for if our ability to do good is given us from above; if, in that respect, we have nothing but what we have received, how unreasonable were it to boast, as if we had not received it! and who sees not that the ideas of merit, and a free gift, are incompatible?

But lastly, to merit, it is required that there should be a proportion between the actions and the reward; which cannot be said of our best works, either in point of excellency, or duration.

Bellarmino himself acknowledges that there must be an absolute equality between the recompense, and the meritorious deed by way of commutative justice. De Jus-  
tific.

ific. l. v. c. 14. From his own words, then, let us judge him; and if the matter be dispassionately canvassed, the Jesuit will be forced to confess, that as there is no proportion between the best works we can do, and that eternal life which is promised to us, so must it be in the highest degree vain, as well as impious, for us to plead the smallest degree of merit on our part. This must appear a self-evident truth to every unprejudiced person, unless we can prove that there is an equality between what is absolutely perfect, and what is on many accounts imperfect; between Finite and Infinite; between the Creature and the Creator.

Those who can suffer themselves to believe this, may suppose that merit attends their actions. But as no man can, on rational grounds, adopt this as an article of his belief, let us, my brethren, learn to think more humbly of ourselves, and as we ought to think. The greatness and excellency of that heavenly glory which is promised in the Gospel to all the faithful servants of Christ, is there declared to exceed all present thought and conception. Let us not then be so vainly and proudly ignorant, as to dream that either our services or our *sufferings*, in this *present life*,  
are



*are worthy to be compared with the glory that is to be revealed.*

Thus have I endeavoured to evince the absurdity and arrogance of this Trent Doctrine of Justification by the merit of good works, by arguments from Scripture, and from the reason of things; and that there may remain no subterfuge for error or imposture in this matter, I proceed to enquire, whether this notion was in any degree countenanced by Catholic Tradition; as under that the Romanists are ever desirous of taking shelter, when Scripture and Reason oppose them.

There is a singular argument, which has been justly adopted by several Protestant writers on this subject, which, of itself, is sufficient to solve the doubts of any reasonable enquirer, as to the novelty of this pretence to the merit of works, in order to our final acceptance with God.

In an Office for Dying Persons, which was allowed, approved, and used in the Church till the Council of Trent, there are two questions to the sick person, which make it manifest that the sense of the Church, before that time, was very different; and, on that account, they are since cautiously omitted. The questions are these.

Q. " Dost

Q. "Dost thou believe that thou shalt come to Heaven, not by thine own merits, but by the virtue and merit of Christ's Passion?"

A. "I do believe it."

Q. "Dost thou believe that Christ died for our salvation, and that none can be saved by their own merits, or any other way but by the merit of his Passion?"

A. "I do believe it."

When, therefore, the Expurgatory Indexes were made, by order of the Council of Trent, with a manifest design of blotting out every hand-writing that appeared against them, this passage was no longer to be endured: the Spanish Indexes expressly say, *those Questions and Answers must be blotted out*. How then, may it be asked, are we to know the Church's Tradition, better than from the Offices used in it? and will it be said here, that the Tradition of the Church in this matter continues the same, when the sense of it is entirely altered? As for the reason of this alteration, that is sufficiently obvious, as I have already intimated. But not to rest the whole upon this single argument, we have still further witness; a cloud of witnesses, though we need them not.

Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, who lived till the beginning of the twelfth century,

century, required that an exhortation should be given to a dying Monk, who, in the opinion of the Romanists, must be possessed of merit sufficient for himself and others; which exhortation was to the following purpose: "That he should believe  
 " that he could not be saved, but by the  
 " Death of Jesus Christ; that he should  
 " confess, that he held the Death of Christ  
 " between himself and God's anger, be-  
 " tween himself and his own ill deserts;  
 " and instead of those merits which he  
 " ought to have, but, alas! has not, he  
 " should offer to God the merit of Christ's  
 " most meritorious Passion: thus shall he  
 " die with assurance, and shall never see  
 " death; eternal death."

We are here to observe, in the first place, that this Anselm was canonized, and consequently could not be supposed to be a Teacher of Heresy, as they call Heresy. Secondly, That this Exhortation, which he directed to be given to dying persons, was once in such high estimation throughout all Europe, that scarce any book relating to Church affairs was to be found without it. Thirdly, That the Church of Rome itself owned it, as Cardinal Hosius bears witness. *Confess. Fidei Petric. cap. 73.* Fourthly, That it was never charged with conveying any pernicious doctrine, till the

the Popes, the Inquisitors of Faith, and the Council of Trent, caused those articles, which I have just mentioned, to be blotted out, as contrary to the belief of their Church. And fifthly, That notwithstanding this condemnation of it by the Expurgatory Indexes, it is still retained, together with those Questions and Answers, which I have already observed to have been expunged by the Spanish Indexes; these, I say, are still retained in France, and may be seen in the Order of Baptism published in the beginning of the seventeenth century. St. Bernard, we find, was of the same opinion with St. Anselm, as to the merit of human performances; insomuch, that to produce all that he has said to that purpose, were to transcribe no small part of his works: nor can any thing be said more effectually to expose and discountenance this absurd, impious and arrogant Trent Doctrine of Merits of Condignity, than what that venerable Father urges in these words. Speaking of Grace and Free-will, "How," says he, "does the Apostle call that crown which he says is laid up for him, a Crown of Righteousness? It is not of his own righteousness, but of God's. If any one, therefore, would give our merits their due name, they are certain  
 " seeds



“ seeds of hope, motives to charity, marks  
 “ of a secret predestination, presages of  
 “ future happiness, the way to a king-  
 “ dom, but by no means the cause which  
 “ does entitle us to it.” The same sense  
 is repeated in various parts of his works;  
 and of this writer it is to be observed, that  
 he was likewise canonized; that he was  
 the most learned man of his time; that  
 he was founder of an order which is dis-  
 persed throughout the western world; and  
 that numbers of Abbots, Bishops and Car-  
 dinals have come out of his school.

Pope Urban the IVth, in the thirteenth  
 age, follows the same doctrine, directly  
 contrary to that of the Trent Council, but  
 altogether consonant to the universally re-  
 ceived opinion of merit before his time.  
 He protests that he appeals from justice to  
 mercy; according to the exhortation of  
 St. Anselm, he confesses that there is no-  
 thing in him able to merit that glory which  
 he waits for: he declares that mercy has  
 no respect to our merits, but only to our  
 misery; and expresses his reliance upon  
 the compassion and long-suffering of God  
 in these terms: “ I do not beg for my  
 “ own merits’ sake, or for thy justice, or  
 “ my own; or for my works’ sake, where-  
 “ in I have miserably gone astray, but for  
 “ thy great mercy.”

Pope

Pope Adrian the VIth, not many years before the Council of Trent, declares that  
 "our merits are a broken reed, which  
 pierce the hand of him that leans upon  
 them; our best actions are mixed with  
 impurities; and when we have done all  
 that we can, we are unprofitable servants."  
 But the decision of this Pope may probably be objected to by our adversaries, as it is recorded of him that he acknowledged that he himself was fallible, and that the Church of Rome was a sink of vices.

The Canons of Cologne, before the Council of Trent, in their Enchiridion, call it *stupidity* to think that good works are rewardable with eternal life, for any dignity in the works themselves. If then there be no dignity in them, there can be no true merit, as the Council of Trent declares with an anathema.

Numberless instances, in short, might here be adduced, were there any necessity for more than those already mentioned, to prove that the ancient and uniform doctrine of the Church, in this respect, was diametrically opposite to the Trent decision, with regard to justification by our own merits.

But to be brief. I shall close this head with the testimony of one of our greatest adversaries,

adversaries, Bellarmine himself. After having impiously asserted, that God is a debtor to man, not only by his own promise, but on the account of our proper works; after this so daring an assertion, he, at last, finds it necessary to confess, that such is the uncertainty of the doctrine of human merit, such the danger of vain-glory, that it is safest to put our trust in the mercy and free favour of God. What need we then any further witness? We have heard his blasphemy, and we have heard his recantation; by which it appears that he has employed his labour and his learning, in defence of a cause which he does not think it safe to adhere to.

I proceed to suggest some few of those pernicious consequences which attend the doctrine of merit, and fully justify our prejudice against it.

In the first place, it tends to elate the minds of men with spiritual pride. Though our adversaries acknowledge in words the influence of grace, yet if we can be thought so far to improve this grace, as to merit eternal life at the hand of God, this thought must naturally elate the spirit, and give ground to boasting, to which in this our fallen and corrupt state we are ever subject; for though pride was never made for

for apostate man, there are, nevertheless, sad remains of it in all of us.

The religion of Popery is too much the dictate of corrupt nature in the unregenerate; but it is a temper abhorred of God, directly opposite to the true spirit of the Gospel, and the stated method of our recovery and salvation.

Secondly, This Romish doctrine derogates from the merits of our Redeemer, which from thence are made to seem no further necessary than to procure the first grace for us; for after that, it seems, men merit for themselves both increase of grace here, and eternal life hereafter. What then is this but to say, that Christ hath not made full satisfaction for our sins, but we must complete the satisfaction? that we are to trust more in what we do ourselves, than in that Redemption which we are assured by the Word of Truth is fully wrought for us by Christ Jesus? A most disgraceful and impious disparagement of his death and righteous merits. The Scriptures teach us, that Christ Jesus is made *to us, of God, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; that by the obedience of one, many are made righteous; that to him that believes, righteousness is imputed:* but as this law of faith excludes boasting, our adversaries had rather venture themselves



selves upon the law of works, and aim at the attainment of grace and eternal life through their own merits, though they perish in their idolatry of self-righteousness.

Therefore, it is to be observed in the third place, that the doctrine of self-justification hath a tendency to mislead men in a concern of the highest and last importance, no less than that of their eternal salvation. 'Tis much to be feared that those who rely upon their own meritorious works, will be found to have raised a building of hay and stubble upon a foundation of sand, and have reason to dread a fatal disappointment. Our adversaries own, indeed, that such works must be the effect of justifying grace; but it is greatly to be questioned, whether any who have felt the power of divine grace, or may be said to know the grace of God in truth, can possibly believe that their works are of a meritorious nature. God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace only to the humble: true grace humbleth the soul the more it is imparted, and lays it low in the sight of God; it makes us sensible that our best deeds are but the bare conditions, and not the efficient cause of our final acceptance; at best, but the dead form and semblance of religion.

How

How dangerous, then, must it be for men to build their hope, how unpardonable to teach others to build theirs, upon such a foundation, to the neglect of Christ, of serious, vital, and practical Religion! This false and erroneous notion, therefore, cannot fail to destroy the hope of the humble and serious Christian. Those who have a just sense of their own imperfection, their weakness and unworthiness, were they to look for no more grace here, nor glory hereafter, than what they could merit at the hand of God, would soon lie down in sorrow and despair.

I shall only add, that as this doctrine nourishes self-confidence, destroys the love of God in the soul, extinguishes the principles and removes the chief grounds of gratitude for our redemption; as it leaves us to act wholly upon the bottom of servile slavish fear, which we are told is incompatible with perfect love, and from respects which can never produce that filial affection which only God requires, and is well pleased with; so does it prepare the way, and lay a foundation for several other Popish doctrines, which are of a most pernicious tendency; such as human satisfaction, works of supererogation, venial sins, pardons, purgatory, indulgencies, and the like; the loss of which would be an irreparable

parable prejudice to the Roman Pontiff, as well as to the whole army of Monks and Friars, who have their dependence on him; though that loss would be far from a real detriment to the Religion of Christ, or to the souls of men.

Finally then, my brethren, conscious of our own unworthiness, let us learn to magnify the riches of the free grace of God, who pardons and accepts us on the condition of our mean endeavours to serve him.

Let us not fail to be zealous of good works, and labour to abound in them, that we be not thought the followers of those who preach up faith alone, to the disparagement of Christian charity and holy living.

Let us do all the good we can, but place no further confidence in our best performances, than to esteem them as comfortable evidences of a *sound* faith: by this faith let us rest on Christ for pardon and peace; *for it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is ever at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.* Let us be thankful for the Reformation, and that we live in those times and places where its influence prevails.

Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Take heed, lest, being led  
away

away by the error of the wicked, you fall from your own stedfastness. Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To whom, with the Father, and Holy Ghost, be ascribed all merit, praise, honour and dominion, henceforth and for ever.

G 3

L E C



# LECTURE V.

## PART I.

HEB. X. ver. 11.

*But this Man, after he had offered one Sacrifice for Sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.*

**T**HE fifth article of the Trent Creed runs thus: " I do profess also, that in the  
 " Mass is offered to God, a true, proper,  
 " and propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick  
 " and the dead; and that, in the most  
 " holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there  
 " is really and substantially the body and  
 " blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and  
 " that there is a conversion of the whole  
 " substance of the bread into his body,  
 " and of the whole substance of the wine  
 " into his blood; which conversion the  
 " Catholic

" Catholic Church calls Transubstantia-  
" tion."

There are three corrupt doctrines in the Church of Rome concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The first is, that the bread and wine are changed into the real body and blood of Christ: the second is, that the body and blood of Christ are really and properly sacrificed and offered by the Priest in every Mass: the third is, that though the bread only be given to the people, yet they receive both the body and blood of Christ, and consequently, that it is sufficient to communicate in one kind only.

The first of these is called by the Romanists the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, on which, it is true, the sacrifice of the Mass is founded, and together with that must stand or fall. This I propose to treat of in my next discourse; and the third, which implies the Half-Communion of the Roman Church, being the entire subject of the sixth article of their Creed, will be taken notice of in its turn. My present design is, that the second of these doctrines, peculiar to that Church, be fairly and impartially canvassed; namely, that the body and blood of Christ are really and properly sacrificed and offered by the

Priest, in every Mass, for the quick and dead.

In this disquisition something is to be freely granted, and something must be flatly denied. We grant that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, if rightly and duly celebrated, may, in some sense, be called a Sacrifice; concerning which term, it were a mere question of words to consider it in its utmost extent and acceptance.

In general, all acts of religious worship may be so called; because something is in them offered up to God. Thus we read of the Sacrifice of a broken and contrite spirit; of praise and thanksgiving; of doing good and communicating; and a Christian's dedicating himself to the service of God is also expressed by the same words, of presenting our *bodies a living Sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God.*

In this large sense of the word, therefore, it is allowed that the Eucharist may, without the least impropriety, be called a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; and accordingly our Church calls it so in the Office of the Holy Communion.

True it is, likewise, that in two other respects, it may also be more strictly called a Sacrifice; namely, because an oblation  
of

of bread and wine is made in it, which, being sanctified, are consumed in an act of religion; and because it is a commemoration and a representation to God of that Sacrifice which Christ offered for us on the cross. For this purpose, indeed, was it instituted; and we call the symbol, or sign, by the thing signified: the bread and wine is called the body and blood of Christ. But if we speak of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as it is described by the Church of Rome, we can by no means allow it to be a Sacrifice, in that sense in which they represent it: it is neither a true and proper Sacrifice, in the strict sense of the word; nor is it a propitiatory Sacrifice; nor is it a Sacrifice for the living, and the dead.

A Sacrifice, strictly speaking, implies mactation and oblation; neither of which, as the Romanists have framed it, are to be found in the Mass. There is no killing, since Christ was slain, once for all, near eighteen hundred years ago; and the Papists themselves call the Mass, an *unbloody* Sacrifice.

There can be no offering of bread or wine, on the supposition that the elements undergo an entire change at the instant of consecration; nor can Christ be said to be offered up to God in the Mass, as he is now



corporally present, unless Transubstantion be true; the consideration of which, as I have said, is to be the subject of another Discourse.

Secondly, There is here no *propitiatory* Sacrifice. The Mass is called, an *unbloody* Sacrifice; and, *without shedding of blood*, we are told, *there is no remission*. It was so under the Tabernacle and the Legal Dispensation, and it is so under the Evangelical Oeconomy. It was so in the type, and it is the same in the anti type; for the effusion of blood under the Law, and the purgations that were made by it, were but figures and representations of that great Propitiation, which was to be made by Christ's shedding of his blood.

It is, therefore, against the plain decision and determination of the Holy Spirit in the forecited text, to say that there is an expiation in an *unbloody* Sacrifice. These assertions confute each other. And on the same account it were absurd to say, that the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was with shedding of blood, is *reiterated* in the Mass, which themselves call an *unbloody* Sacrifice. Thus do our adversaries run into manifest contradictions and inconsistencies.

If, again, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be now a proper Sacrifice, it must have

have been so at first, since it is supposed that they would not go beyond the original institution. If then it was a proper Sacrifice, when Christ himself celebrated that Supper with his Apostles; it follows, that by offering up his body and blood at that time to God, as a proper Sacrifice, Christ laid down his life, and expiated for the sins of the world, before he suffered on the cross: that he died twice, and expiated a second time for the sins of mankind, the first expiation being insufficient. These, and other unscriptural and palpable incoherences, are the necessary consequence of the Popish doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass; which, if it is not available for the living, neither can be for the dead; for this reason likewise, namely, that, according to the current sense of Scripture, the sins of all men must be expiated in this life, or not at all. Every man shall be judged according to his deeds done in the body; and as the tree falleth, so shall it lie.

If we come next to Scripture proofs, how often is it said, that Christ *once* suffered, and died, and made himself a Sacrifice for sin? Rom. vi. 10. *In that he died, he died unto sin once*; that is, he died *once*, and no more, to satisfy for sin. Heb. vii. 27. He needed not daily to offer up sacrifice;

for this he did once, when he offered up himself, once for all: and consequently no offering up of himself was required afterwards. Heb. ix. 26. *Now once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared, to put away sin by the Sacrifice of himself.* And again, ver. 28. *Christ was once offered, to bear the sins of many.*

Why then is our blessed Redeemer pretended to be offered, day by day, in the Roman Mass, by their Priests? Were it not sufficient, that the Scripture is wholly silent as to the Sacrifice of the Mass, as now modelled by the Church of Rome, certainly these and many similar texts must be known, by any dispassionate judge, to oppose any such pretensions.

It is through the sufferings and death of Christ that we are sanctified; and that offering of his body was made once for all: who then shall presume to crucify him afresh, in this his glorified state? *Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. In that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God.* Rom. vi. 9. From hence we may, with the Apostle, justly infer, that as we are baptized into his death, we ought likewise to reckon ourselves also to *be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

This

This moral and religious instruction, I say, we find conveyed to us in these words of the Apostle; but nothing relative to the Sacrifice of the Mass, but what directly tends to overthrow that doctrine. This, indeed, is done effectually by the very institution of the Eucharist, as recorded by three of the Evangelists, and by the Apostle St. Paul. Our Saviour, when he instituted his last Supper, stood not at an altar; but sat, or leaned at a table: he offered nothing to God but prayers, and praises, or thanksgivings. What he gave to his disciples, was bread and wine; not to be worshipped or sacrificed, but to be eaten and drunken. What they did, they were to do in remembrance of Christ; not for an expiation of their sins: the Apostles delivered to us what they received of Christ; not a Sacrifice, but a Sacrament.

Thus widely different is the pretended Sacrifice of the Mass from a devout participation of our Lord's Supper, as instituted by Christ himself. In the Mass, the Priest pretends to offer Christ to God, who, as they say, receives him as a Sacrifice, with which he is well pleased; but in the Lord's Supper, God gives Christ to us, whom we receive by faith, and he spiritually dwelleth in us.

In



In the Mass, Christ is repeatedly offered as a Sacrifice : in the Lord's Supper we exhibit a standing memorial of his former sufferings on the cross, once for all.

In the Mass, they say Christ offers himself, though they had before said, the Priest offered him for a Sacrifice : in the Lord's Supper, Christ gave to his disciples bread, and said, *Take, eat* ; he gave wine, and said, *Drink ye all of this* : and that, according to St. Mark's account, ch. xiv. 23. even before he had pronounced it to signify his blood.

In the Mass, the Papists represent Christ as bidding his disciples to offer him in Sacrifice ; but, in the Lord's Supper, all Reformed Christians rationally understand him to have meant thus much, *Do this in remembrance of me*, and continue the observance of this rite till my second coming.

In the Mass, the Priest reserves one half to himself, oftener the whole : what he delivers to the people is not bread, but a wafer ; in which Christ is by the Romanists declared to be present, as to his human nature, in direct contradiction to his own words, *I go to my Father* ; and again, *Me ye have not always*. And lastly, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we honour Christ as our only Saviour ; whereas Masses are said in honour of pretended Saints, and  
by

by way of suffrage for the dead. So evident then is the difference between these two, that if one of them be of Christ's institution, the other plainly is not.

The Popish doctrine of the Mass is, in fact, a complication of the grossest errors; for in it are included the Sacrament in one kind, Transubstantion, Prayers for the dead, Purgatory, Idolatry. In this last lies the chief abomination of the Mass, not only in the adoration of the elements, but in that they are offered to God, as if they were themselves a God. They are looked upon as Mediators and Redeemers; as making atonement for the sins of the people, and are worshipped and adored as such.

We may further argue against the Sacrifice of the Mass, from the inconsistency of a Sacrament and a Sacrifice, that the same thing should be one and the other, especially under the Evangelical Dispensation.

A Sacrament is a pledge and seal of God's grace to us, and is received as such by the faithful; but a Sacrifice is something offered unto God, and graciously accepted by him from us, or on our account. Again, the Scripture is full and express in asserting the unity of Christ's Priesthood and Sacrifice; therefore the Priests of Rome  
are

are no proper sacrificing Priests; and the Popish Mass no proper Sacrifice. This they must grant, unless they will deny Christ to have been a proper Priest, and his oblation on the cross a proper Sacrifice. Christ alone received and fulfilled his Father's command, to lay down his life for his sheep. John x. 18.

All the Priests and Sacrifices of the Old Testament were types of him, as the Apostle to the Hebrews largely proves; he was the only High Priest that was such as became us, as sufficient to answer the necessity of our case, being *holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and higher than the heavens*; more excellent than the highest angels. Heb. vii. 26. He is our only Mediator; and, therefore, our only Priest. 1 Tim. ii. 5. for his priesthood flows from his mediation, in which he has no partners or successors; his priesthood only is eternal and unchangeable. Heb. vii. 24.

And as his priesthood was singular, so was his Sacrifice. He needed not daily to offer up Sacrifices, but did then sufficiently atone for sin, when he once offered up himself. This is so fully insisted on in the ninth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, that whoever, on the perusal, will consider the weight and consequence of the Apostle's arguments therein contained,

tained, will be abundantly satisfied, that there never was, nor can be, any more than one true, real, proper, propitiatory Sacrifice of which the legal sacrifices were but types; and therefore the Mass is not, cannot be a proper Sacrifice; much less, the very same (as the Papists say it is) with that which Christ himself offered upon the cross.

But the Romanists pretend to solve all this, by distinguishing between a Sacrifice of redemption or satisfaction, and a Sacrifice of application and worship; between a bloody and an unbloody Sacrifice; between one which is primitive and primary, and one which is only secondary and dependent; and between a Sacrifice of immolation, and a Sacrifice of representation and commemoration. But besides that all these are distinctions coined at pleasure, and which have no footstep or foundation either in reason or Scripture, they by no means answer the purpose, and are indeed all of them, but especially the last, a mean desertion of their cause: for if the Eucharist be allowed by them to be no more than a Sacrifice of representation and commemoration, why do they contend so strenuously for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which would in that case be no longer necessary to be held? Why have they so inhumanly sacrificed to this Moloch



losh the lives of so many thousands, whose chief offence was their disapprobation of so absurd and impious a tenet?

Nothing, in short, can possibly be assigned in the celebration of the Mass, with which the essence and formality of a proper sacrifice can agree. Not the breaking of bread, because the body of Christ is impassible; and they deny that this is essential to the Sacrifice, by giving their wafers whole: not in the oblation by the Priest, because themselves grant that this was not done by our Saviour and his Apostles; nor is the oblation in the Mass made in the name of Christ, but of the Priest: not in the blessing; for to bless, and to offer, are two things: nor yet in the consecration, for the same reason: not in the eating; for this is not offered to God, but received from him: nor is it the act of a Priest, as such, but of every communicant: so that if this constitutes the Sacrifice, all the people must be Priests, which it is presumed would not be allowed.

The Sacrifice of the Mass is indeed replete with such absurdities and contradictions, as it would be endless to recount: there is in it, for instance, an external visible Sacrifice; and yet the victim, or thing sacrificed, cannot be seen.

That

That there is blood shed we ought to suppose, as, without that, we are told, there is no remission; consequently the Sacrifice would not be propitious: and yet, at the same time, they tell us, that it is an unbloody Sacrifice. The true body of Christ is said to be therein offered to God the Father; and yet it is neither visible, tangible, extended, nor circumscribed; and, therefore, not Christ's real body, nor any true and real body at all.

To complete the whole, it seems that, in the celebration of the Mass, a wicked Priest can make the God that made him, and eat him when he has done; a species of blasphemy, which no Pagan, Turk, or Jew, has yet been capable of. Witness that memorable saying of Averroes, the Arabian philosopher: "I have travelled (says he) " all the world over; and " amongst all the various sects of religion, I never met with any so sottish " and stupid, as that of those who eat " their God."

But let us allow the Romanists to speak for themselves, since, no doubt, they have some specious pretence to conceal, as much as possible, their deformity from the eyes of those who are either wilfully or judicially blind.

There is never wanting with them some passage of Scripture which they wrest to defend.

defend the worst of their opinions. In the present case they lay great stress upon the following:—In the eleventh verse of the first chapter of Malachi it is said, *From the rising of the Sun, even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering.* This prophecy relates to the rejecting of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles: it is here foretold that *God's name shall be great among these latter*: that is, he shall be known and worshipped by them; that not only in *Judea* (as at that time) but in *every place*, in all parts and regions of the world, the true God shall be owned and adored, and his service and worship shall be set up, which are here expressed by the names of *Incense* and a *pure Offering*. It is usual, both in the Old and New Testament, to set forth the Evangelical worship by Legal terms: thus it is frequently styled a Sacrifice, and thus *Incense* and *Offering* here signify those spiritual Oblations and Sacrifices which are required under the Gospel dispensation; and they are rightly called a *pure offering*, in contradiction to the *polluted services* of the Jews, against whom the Prophet Malachi repeatedly complains; and likewise to express that more than ordinary *purity, sincerity, and integrity*, which

are

are required in all our religious services under the Second Covenant; when (as our Saviour saith) *the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him.* John iv. 23. This is a plain and just account of this passage in Malachi: but who could have imagined that this should ever be adduced as an impregnable proof of the Sacrifice of the Mass? No one, certainly, who has not imbibed the principles of the Romish Theology, can pretend to draw this inference; *Incense shall be offered to God's name, and a pure offering;* therefore there ought to be daily in the Christian Church an offering of Christ's body and blood, as a propitiatory Sacrifice both for the dead and the living. Another text, of which the champions for the Roman cause would here avail themselves, is this. Heb. xiii. 10. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat who serve the Tabernacle—whence they would infer, that under the Christian Dispensation there is a proper altar and a sacrifice; namely, that of the Mass. This inference it were needless to confute, since a bare view of the context will convince us that these expressions relate to Christ, who was sacrificed on the altar of the cross; of the benefits of whose meritorious oblation  
none



none can be partakers who adhere to the Mosaic rites, and the ceremonial worship enjoined by the Law. The Romanists again argue in favour of their Mass, from the instance of Melchisedeck's offering bread and wine to Abraham. True it is, that some of the ancient Fathers have compared this offering to that of the Elements in the Eucharist; but none of them make use of it to prove a real Sacrifice there; and accordingly, it is observable that, though it is said that *Melchisedeck brought forth bread and wine*, Gen. xiv. 18. yet is it not said that he *offered bread and wine*; much less that he offered them to God, since it was to Abraham, and his company, that this present was made, to refresh them after the fatigues of war. Melchisedeck, therefore, it is plain, offered no Sacrifice; and, if he had, it affects not the present cause; unless it can be proved, from his oblation of bread and wine, that Christ must be, and is really and personally offered every day in the Mass for the expiation of the sins of the world.

Those ancient Fathers of the Church, of whose authority the Romanists would willingly avail themselves, never dreamt of sacrificing Christ in the Eucharist. It was bread and wine only, which they thought the Priests of the Christian Religion were

to offer to God. This plainly appears from those answers which they returned to the reproach of the Heathens who charged them with irreligion, as having no Sacrifice among them. They never answered, by alledging that they offered up to God a Sacrifice of inestimable value; which must have been the first answer that could have occurred to a man possessed with the ideas of the Church of Rome. On the contrary, Justin Martyr in his Apology says, *They had no other Sacrifice but prayers and praises*: in his Dialogue with Trypho he confesses that *Christians offer to God oblations*, according to Malachi's prophecy, when they celebrate the Eucharist in which they commemorate the Lord's death. Both Anaxagoras and Minutius Felix justify the Christians for having no other Sacrifices but pure hearts, clean consciences, and a steadfast faith. Origen and Tertullian refute the same objection in the same manner; setting the prayers of Christians against all the sacrifices that were amongst the Heathens. Clemens of Alexandria, and Arnobius, write in the same strain; and all make use of one topick to justify their offering no Sacrifice; namely, that God, who made all things, and to whom all things belong, needs nothing from his creatures.

Not

Not to multiply quotations, it were easy to shew further on this head, from all the rituals of the ancients, that they had none of those ideas that are now maintained by the Romanists. They had but one altar in a church, and probably but one in a city; they had but one communion in a day at that altar; so far were they from the many altars in every church, and the many Masses at every altar that are now in the Roman Church. They knew no solitary Masses, without Communicants. All the liturgies, and all the writings of the ancients are as expresse in this matter as possible; and the whole constitution of their worship and discipline evidently shew it.

Once more; the Romanists alledge that the Paschal Lamb was a type of the *Mass*. A type of Christ indeed it was, and so amply fulfilled in him, that there is no room for any further accomplishment of it: besides that the Passover was not so much a Sacrifice, as a Sacrament; so that, if it was a type of the Eucharist, then, by their own argument, the Lord's Supper must be a Sacrament.

Thus do the patrons of the Roman cause vainly search out for arguments where they are not to be found; and on such andy foundations have they erected the  
Sacrifice

the Mass is their daily and continual offering, and the principal observance in which their Religion consists: it is, they tell us, of the greatest profit and advantage to all persons: to their clergy it is unquestionably so; whose maintenance, for the greatest part, arises from the merchandise which they make of the Holy Sacrament, by bartering the blood of their Redeemer at a dearer rate than Judas once did. The saying of Masses keeps an army of priests in pay, and has amassed a greater treasure than the richest exchequer in the world could ever boast. By this the greatest monasteries were founded; abbeys erected; and in the days of our forefathers had well nigh brought all the estates of this kingdom into the hands of churchmen.

This is the truest patrimony of their Church; far exceeding the pretended donation of Constantine, or the actual grants of succeeding Monarchs; so evidently considerable, in short, has been the *gain* of it, that, even on that account alone, one would be apt to suspect its *Godliness*; and what a former Pope (Leo X.) impiously boasted of the Religion of the Holy Jesus, may, with the strictest truth, be applied to this superstitious abuse of it, namely, what immense treasures have ac-

H

crued



crued to the Roman Church from this fable!

To conclude then ; Do your utmost, my brethren, to establish yourselves in the truth, in opposition to the erroneous tenets of the Romanists, concerning the Oblation of Christ. Rest fully persuaded of what your own Church asserts, *Art. 31*, that  
 “ the offering of Christ, once made, is that  
 “ perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and  
 “ Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole  
 “ World, both original and actual; and  
 “ that there is none other satisfaction for  
 “ Sin, but that alone.”

Remember the words of that Proto-Reformer Martin Luther. “ No tongue,” saith he, “ is able to express the abominations of the Mass, neither can the heart of man comprehend the same. It were no wonder if God, for the sake thereof, long since had destroyed the world with fire and brimstone.”

And here again our Church directs us to abhor the impious and pernicious doctrine of the repeated Sacrifice of Christ. *Art. 31*. “ The Sacrifice of Masses, in the  
 “ which it was commonly said that the  
 “ Priests did offer Christ for the Quick and  
 “ the Dead, to have remission of pain or  
 “ guilt, were blasphemous fables, and  
 “ dangerous deceits.”

Be

Be thankful, then, for Protestant Sacraments in the room of Popish Masses.

Dread a worldly Religion where gain is Godliness.

Learn to account Scripture Godliness the greatest, and only gain, whatever you lose by it in this present time.

Neither neglect the Ordinances of the Christian Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, nor pervert or corrupt it by unbecoming ingredients; the want of a due preparation, serious and devout behaviour at the participation of that Holy Ordinance, or a correspondent demeanour after it.

Thus if we duly receive Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the experience and assistance which we gain there will thoroughly fortify us against that, and all other Popish errors; and we shall continue to learn and practise the truth, as it is in Christ Jesus—to whom with the Father and Holy Spirit &c.

---



---

# LECTURE V.

---



---

## PART II.

---

I COR. XI. 23, 24.

*The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.*

**T**HOUGH the Presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist has been the unanimous opinion of the Church in all ages; yet, as to the nature and mode of this Presence, various, and even contradictory, have been the sentiments of believers. The primitive Writers of the Church, it is true, made use of the sublimest figures, and the most exalted expressions, when speaking of this Ordinance, fearful of the profanation  
of

of this Sacrament by unworthy receivers; and with the laudable design of creating a due reverence for the most solemn and sacred of Christian rites.

In the fifth century, by the incursion of barbarous and uncivilized nations, Europe was speedily overcast with a savage ignorance, and worse than Egyptian darkness; learning of every kind, was in a manner banished, and the study of the Scriptures almost entirely neglected. Succeeding ages became of course more illiterate and more corrupt. The Popes, by the accounts of their own Historiographers, were, in general, monsters of men; bent solely on the aggrandizement of their own authority, and on subjecting the temporal to the spiritual power. This they effected, in great measure, by their artifice, and influence over the clergy, who readily espoused every opinion which might tend to raise their own persons and character; and, to this purpose, nothing could be more conducive than the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or the belief that a Priest, by a few words, could convert a wafer into the God that made him.

If we enquire more precisely into the rise and origin of this doctrine, we shall find the first foundation of it laid in a cloister, by an unwary Monk, about the



beginning of the seventh century; carried on by a cabal of men, assembled under the name of a General Council, to introduce the worship of images into the Church in the year 787; formed more into shape, in the beginning of the ninth century, by another Monk, afterwards Abbot of Cluney; who, in this attempt, was opposed and refuted by almost all the learned men of his age: but in the eleventh century, when the Pope's power was greatly increased, and the doctrines of extirpating Heretics, and deposing Kings and Princes, were reduced to practice, the terror of being condemned to the stake as a Heretic, effectually silenced all contradiction to this absurd and impious tenet of Transubstantiation; so that it was afterwards attempted to be made a matter of faith in the thirteenth century, when the name and sanction of an Œcumenical Council was once more abused, by a shameful submission to the arbitrary dictates of an imperious Pontiff, Pope Innocent III. of whom a Popish historian and ecclesiastic, Matthew Paris by name, hath left this character upon record: that he was, "beyond all mortals, "proud and ambitious; a lion in cruelty, "a blood-sucker in avarice, and prone to "every kind of wickedness for a bribe or "a promise." It is observable, that this

was

was the Pope who founded the Inquisition, by advice of St. Dominic, and who plundered this devoted Nation, so long and so unmercifully, during the wretched reign of Henry III.

Such was the origin of this extraordinary doctrine, 1215 years after Christ; though still the most learned men of that and the following ages hesitated not to dissent from it, as I propose to shew in its proper place.

The immediate consequence of this decree was, that a train of ceremonies and institutions were devised in honour of that Deified Bread, as it was impiously called, which are still in use in the Church of Rome; amongst which, that which most of all captivated the minds of the people, and that far beyond any sanction of the Church, or exhortation of the Clergy, was the appointment of the annual festival of the Holy Sacrament, or, as it is called, the Body of Christ. This was ordered to be universally observed, first, in the year 1311, by Pope Clement V. who, after the example of his predecessors, then ruled a Council, held at that time at Vienne in France. Such was the rise and progress of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which was finally established, as an article of faith, in the Council of Trent; that last general

Council which was closed in the year 1563, and is the standard of modern Popery.

The decree is thus expressed; that "by  
 " the consecration of bread and wine, Je-  
 " sus Christ, very God and very man, is  
 " truly, really, and substantially contained  
 " under the species of those sensible signs:  
 " that there is a conversion of the whole  
 " substance of bread, in this Holy Sacra-  
 " ment, into the whole substance of the  
 " body of Christ, and of the whole sub-  
 " stance of wine into his blood; which  
 " conversion is fitly and properly called  
 " Transubstantiation." S. xiii. c. 6. And  
 the Council, as usual, denounces an *anathema* against all *who believe and teach other-  
 wise*.

This is further explained in the Trent Catechism; that it is the *true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and is now in heaven, together with his soul and divinity*: that it is *entire in every part of the bread, and every drop of the wine*; and that *no part of the substance of bread and wine remains*: that the *accidents of bread and wine, which do remain, are in no subject, but exist by themselves in a wonderful manner, and which is not too curiously to be enquired into*. Catech. ad Parochos, p. 2, De Euchar.



This

This is the opinion held by the Church of Rome, and is imposed as a necessary matter of belief, on all that are of that Communion. On the contrary, our Church utterly denies our Saviour's natural body to be so *really present* in the blessed Sacrament, as either to leave heaven, or to exist in *several places at the same time*: we deny, moreover, that in the sacred elements which we receive, there is any other substance than that of bread and wine distributed to the communicants: so that all which the doctrine of our Church implies By this phrase, is only a real presence of Christ's invisible *power* and *grace*, so in, and with the *elements*, as by the faithful receiving of them to convey spiritual and real effects to the souls of men. As the bodies assumed by angels might be called their bodies, while they assumed them; or rather, as the Church is the body of Christ, because of his Spirit quickening and enlivening the souls of believers, so the bread and wine, after consecration, are not the real, but the spiritual and mystical body of Christ.

Agreeably to this explanation, our Catechism declares, that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. It is by faith that Christ is received,



and not by sense; and thus he becomes, not our carnal, but our spiritual food. If, with a true penitent heart, and lively faith, we receive that Holy Sacrament, we then *spiritually* eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood; we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us. Thus Inspired Men of old are said to have been filled with the Holy Ghost; and thus may devout and worthy Communicants be said to be filled with Christ; that is, after a spiritual manner: for, to apply our Saviour's own words on this occasion; *a spirit bath not flesh and bones*, as men saw that he had when upon earth; and would still see, were his natural body present with us.

The question, therefore, between us and the Romanists is not, whether Christ be, in *any* sense, present in the Holy Sacrament; since, in the sense already mentioned, we declare, that he is there verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful: nor need we differ with them, as they do among themselves, as to the manner in which the elements are converted into Christ's natural body, and blood, since we deny that it is done: nor, again, do we dispute with them, whether there be any change in the bread and wine after consecration, since we grant that there is a very  
great

great one ; namely, a moral change which respects the use of the elements, though not a physical one as to their nature and substance, in which latter respect the bread and wine remain the same after consecration ; but greatly different as to their use and ends ; as wax, when it becomes a seal, or silver, when it is coined.

Thus much being premised, I proceed to examine the modern doctrine of Transubstantiation in the Roman Church, which, next to that of their infallibility, is the most valued of all their tenets, and the most important in itself, as constituting the main part of their worship ; being the favorite doctrine of their Theologists, and maintained with such furious and relentless zeal, as to have long since obtained the appellation of their great burning article : but which, on the contrary, being proved to be a senseless innovation, and a pernicious error, our reformation is justified, our religion confirmed, and our laws defended.

With this view I proceed to evince the impossibility, as well as the absurdity of Transubstantiation from the following topics and criterions ; namely, from sense, from reason, from Scripture, and from the general consent of the Church, in all ages.

As we consist of a conscious principle, and a material body, so the only powers by which

which we attain our knowledge, are our reason, and our senses; and we have no other by which to raise ideas, or pass a judgment on any thing. We justly conclude that God will deal with us in all our transactions suitably to the nature he has given us, and not contrary to it.

Whatsoever therefore is contrary, either to our bodily senses, or the reason of our minds, is justly accounted absurd. If these criterions are no longer allowed, if these passages are once stopt, or supposed, when perfect, unimpaired and duly exercised, to be incapable of conveying instruction, or information to the mind, we must then resign all hopes of ever knowing any thing, and submit to live and die like brutes, without any sense of duty or religion.

Nevertheless, upon this preposterous and absurd supposition the whole fabrick of Popery is erected; for if the idea of Transubstantiation were once discarded, there could be no Sacrifice in the Mass, and on that pretended Sacrifice it is well known that almost the whole of the Roman worship is grounded; and so considerable are the profits arising from the sale of Masses said, or pretended to be said, as in fact to constitute the chief patrimony of the Roman Church.

Who can possibly admit the idea of Transubstantiation

substantiation, without acknowledging, at the same time, that four of his five senses concur in deceiving him? If he can either see or feel, taste or smell, he must know, and be as certain as he is capable of receiving conviction, that wine is not blood, nor bread a human body; or in other words, that the elements made use of in the Blessed Eucharist are really what they appear to be to every one whose senses are perfect and unimpaired; and that, after consecration as well as before.

They are then separated, it is true, to a sacred use, as a memorial of the death of Christ, and of the new covenant; which is the proper consecration of them; and on that account ought not to be applied to any ordinary purposes—but still we must know that their nature and substance, their figure, and even their inward properties remain still unaltered, if we suffer ourselves to be determined by the concurrent testimony of our senses, and those of all mankind, and at all times, in that which is a proper object of sense.

The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is far from being an object of sense; so much so, that it is even above reason, though not contrary to it, as I hope to prove that Transubstantiation evidently is. But in a case where sense must be allowed to be the  
proper



proper test and criterion, we ought unquestionably to attend to the only infallible evidence which the author of our nature has in that case afforded us.

The evidence of sense is the foundation of all our knowledge, natural and acquired. It is the voice of those perceptive faculties wherewith God has endued us, and therefore is no other than the voice of God in us. Through the evidence of sense it is that God has revealed his will and mysteries to mankind in a manner the most convincing; namely, by miracles: and to this evidence our Saviour himself appealed for the reality of his personal appearance to his Disciples after his resurrection. *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see.* LUKE xxiv, 39. Those, therefore, who question the evidence of sense, undermine the foundations of Christianity, and we may add, even of Popery itself; for in this case a difficulty arises which it unquestionably behoves the Romanists to solve, before they presume to argue against the conviction of the senses; and with that, for brevity, I shall close this head. Namely, since all our faculties are alike the gift of our wise Creator, who endued us with them for beneficial and excellent purposes, why are we to discard some of these, and retain others? Or, in plainer terms, as in  
the

the affair of Transubstantiation, why are we to believe our ears more than our eyes? and if, as the Propounders of that hard doctrine seem to intimate, we are not to credit any one of our senses, how can we possibly be assured, when the Priest declares the reality of Transubstantiation that our hearing does not deceive us, that he does not pronounce words of a very distant signification, or by the omission of a single negative, convey a meaning directly opposite to that, which from those words which we hear with our outward ears, we suppose him to point out?

To proceed then; whoever would list himself a Member of the Roman Communion, after suffering himself to be thus deprived of his senses, or of the use of them, which does not much mend the matter, must be content to go still further, and resign his reason also. "The wit and judgment of Catholics," says Mr. Cressy, "is to renounce their own judgment, and depose their own wit."

Reason is a silly, dim-sighted, hood-winked thing; filled with prejudices within; surrounded with darkness and precipices without: how acute soever and sagacious it may be as to secular affairs, it is blind as to those which are spiritual, and will necessarily lead a man out of the road

road to Salvation, if not conducted and supported by an infallible guide. Thus, by this guide, meaning herself, the Church of Rome daily addresses those to whom she would recommend her doctrine. Strange as it may seem, that any should have the presumption to pay so ill a compliment to a rational being, it is doubtless still more unaccountable that such doctrine should ever be listened to with tameness and serenity. The attempt to persuade a man to make over the use of his senses and understanding, to have no more reason of his own, but to shut his eyes that he may see with those of another more clearly, is indeed the height of arrogance; but that so daring an attempt should ever meet with success is much more astonishing!

What can appear more absurd than to presume to reason a man out of his reason, or persuade him that the best use he can make of the best of his faculties is, once for all, to renounce the use of it henceforward? If it be, as the Papists would represent it, a crooked rule, a dangerous master, it ought never to be depended upon; but if it may be listened to in one instance, why not in others?

If, for instance, a weak or wavering Protestant, or one to whom all religions are indifferent, if such a man is to make the

the best use of his reason in weighing the advantages which are tendered to him with a view to induce him to change his Communion, why may not he be allowed to make the same use of his understanding in enquiring once more into the grounds and reasons of his former faith?

That human reason is greatly corrupted by the Fall, is readily acknowledged; but that still we are reasonable creatures, and that God deals with us as such, is no less evident. We must then attend to, and improve our reason, such as it is, according to the utmost of our abilities, and implore the assistance of God's Holy Spirit to lead us into all truth, and to sanctify it to us.

Pride of reason is bad, but contempt of it seems to be worse; for Revelation can have no hold of him who despiseth his reason, that is his own soul: such most justly, and yet most necessarily perish.

To profess Christianity upon solid grounds a man must be convinced of its truth and divine origin; examine its several doctrines, and perceive its suitableness to, and connection with some primary and unquestionable principles, with some standard and rule of a divine original. But where, may it well be asked, are those principles, that standard, that rule to be found, if not in reason itself? that heaven-born



born faculty, congenial with the soul of man? Without reason, Faith becomes mere credulity, and a resolute adherence to that faith, no better than stubbornness.

Actuated by a faith destitute of all motives of credibility, a man may as soon turn Mahometan or Heathen; or, to speak more rationally, he ought to profess no belief at all; since, without some kind of proof, nothing can be admitted.

What proofs then can the Romanists offer in support of the doctrine of Transubstantiation? As it opposes the evidence of our senses, does not almost every circumstance relating to it, directly contradict the verdict of our reason, in like manner? Not to mention all the insufferable consequences of a literal interpretation of our Saviour's words, *this is my body*, such as the barbarity of eating human flesh, and what is infinitely worse, the flesh of an incarnate God, an action so horridly savage, that a Christian ought to dread it more than death; besides this, and other insuperable obstacles to the admission of such a doctrine by any sober and unbiaſſed mind, if we consult reason in the case, innumerable absurdities must follow.

If our Saviour, when he instituted the sacrament, changed the bread into his real Body and the wine into his real Blood, it must

must have been true that the bread which Christ blessed and brake, and gave to his Disciples, was his real body, whilst, at the same time, his real body was in an erect or inclined posture before them; and the wine his real blood, whilst it was actually circulating in his veins. It must have been true that he really gave himself to his Apostles with his own hands; that the Apostles eat him and drank him, and yet, that he continued unaltered and untouched.

If the doctrine of Transubstantiation be true, it will follow that the same body may be in Heaven, and upon earth, and in thousands of different and distant parts of the earth at one moment of time; be extended, and not extended; be contained whole and entire, under one wafer, and still that wafer may be divided into as many new distinct bodies of Christ, as there are particles; and yet all, one and the same body. Were this doctrine true, accidents might exist without their subjects, or the qualities of bodies without any body of which they are qualities.

So that there might be whiteness, without any thing white; sweetness, without any thing sweet; roundness, without any thing round. Were this doctrine of annihilation and re-production true, one lighted candle might light the whole world; one man make

make a great army; one jar of water quench the thirst of all mankind: while, on the other hand, it would be in the power of a certain number of priests, duly situated, by pronouncing a few words, to annihilate all the bread and wine in the world. Again, Transubstantiation destroys the very notion of a Sacrament, which is to represent something that is not seen, or present. It is agreed on both sides, that it is the nature of a Sacrament to have an outward sign, and an inward grace, signified by that sign. - If in the Mass the elements are annihilated, they cannot be signs; and upon the supposition that the natural Body and Blood of Christ are present in the room of those elements of Bread and Wine, it is not possible that they should constitute the Sacramental signs, since it were an absurdity to say that any thing can represent itself.

I shall only add, that right reason requires a figurative, and not a literal interpretation of those words of our Saviour, *This is my body*. It is a known rule that, when a proposition is infallibly true, and yet cannot possibly be true in a literal sense, we must understand it figuratively. These words then, of our Saviour, are infallibly true, because he hath spoken them. It is plain from the evidence of sense, as well

as reason, that they cannot be true when understood literally; therefore, they must be true in a figurative sense, and in that sense only. Thus, when our Saviour declares to his Disciples, *I am the good Shepherd; I am the Door; I am the Vine; you are the Branches*; no one ever dreamt that these expressions were to be construed in any other than a figurative sense: nor were his words, *this is my Body, this is my Blood*, ever taken in a literal sense, any more than when, again, he tells them this cup is the new Testament; till the modern Church of Rome, for the worldly purpose of her own lucre and aggrandizement, obtruded upon her votaries the harsh, and incoherent doctrine of Transubstantiation.

But, say the Romanists, with God nothing is impossible; and that ought to silence all opposition.

But this rule is so far from being without exception, that, besides that it is not possible for God to sin, who is purity itself, or for him to err, who is the fountain of all wisdom; so neither is it in the power of Omnipotence itself to act a contradiction or to cause a thing to be, and not to be, at the same time; which would be the case; could there be truth in Transubstantiation.

Again, they tell you that this arguing signifies nothing, because reason is to submit



mit to Revelation. But where is Transubstantiation revealed? We acknowledge the belief of the Blessed Trinity, which is above our reason, though not contrary to it; neither is it an object of sense; and this we believe because we find it revealed in Scripture; but as for Transubstantiation, though it were within the reach of Omnipotence, we are not to judge of what God has done, by what he is able to do; nor can we prove the fact from the bare possibility of its being performed; and the Scriptures are wholly silent as to this matter, unless in such passages as imply an entire refutation of so gross an error.

This comes next to be considered.

If then this Sacrament had been that mysterious and incomprehensible thing which it has been since believed to be, we cannot imagine but that the books of the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles, and their Epistles would have conveyed fuller explanations of it, and larger instructions about it. Enough, indeed, is said in them, to support the plain and natural sense which we give to this institution; but, as to that in which the Romanists would have it to be understood, the very silence of Scripture is sufficient to confute it. That those passages which they quote from the sixth Chapter of St. John make  
more

more against, than for them, has been repeatedly and amply proved. In that discourse of our Saviour, his design was to shew that the Christian doctrine was more excellent than the law of Moses; though Moses gave the Israelites manna from Heaven to nourish their bodies, yet, notwithstanding that, they died in the wilderness: but Christ was to give his followers such food as should give them life: so that if they did eat of it, they should never die; where it is apparent that the bread and nourishment must be such as the life was; and that being eternal and spiritual, the bread must be so understood: for it is clearly expressed how that food was to be received; *he that believeth on me, hath everlasting life.*

Since then he had formerly said that the *Bread* which he was to give, should make them *live for ever*; and since it is here said, that this life is given by faith, then must this bread be no other than his doctrine; for this is that which Faith receives. The expressions of eating and drinking, frequently met with in Scripture, signifying, agreeably to their common use amongst Eastern nations, the receiving and imbibing a doctrine, or acquiring any intellectual attainment, which are the food of the soul.

In

In the whole tenor of St. Paul's discourse to the Corinthians on this subject, there is nothing which favours such an exposition as Cardinal Bellarmine gives, relative to the institution and celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

We find no hint of any physical change, not a syllable relating to the destruction of the Elements, not one word of adoration ; no mention at all of complicated mysteries and miracles, such as our adversaries maintain. Yet surely one might suppose that the Apostle would never have omitted such essential points, when he had the fairest occasion, and all the reason that could be supposed to take notice of them. The avowed scope of this part of his Epistle, was to redress those abuses which had crept into the Church of Corinth in celebrating the Holy Sacrament, one whereof was their joining this sacred rite with their ordinary meals. How natural was it, on such a supposition, for a zealous Apostle to have told them, that the mystery which they profaned was that individual Body of their Saviour, who was crucified for them ; that Christ was there as corporeally present as in Heaven ; that they held him in their very hands, and should kneel down prostrate, and adore him ! These are topicks which every common preacher in the Roman Church makes use

use of, to deter his hearers from communicating unworthily. And such admonitions, could they have been tendered with propriety, would more effectually have prevented all irregularities. But St. Paul was an utter stranger to *Transubstantiation*. He knew nothing of a *crude carnal Presence*: and accordingly, we find his instructions are quite in another strain; reminding the Corinthians of the end of the institution, which was a memorial of Christ's passion, and that they became obnoxious and subject to the divine judgment in not distinguishing that Sacred Ordinance, in which Christ was more closely united to them, from their usual Repast. Many eminent Divines of the Roman Church concede still further, that Transubstantiation has no foundation in, or cannot be proved from Scripture. This Bellarmine owns. "It is not altogether improbable that there is no express place of Scripture to prove Transubstantiation, without the declaration of the Church; as Scotus said." Exercit. lib. 6. *videlicet* Gabriel Biel says, "How the Body of Christ is in the Sacrament, is not expressed in the canon of the Bible." Cardinal Alliaco, "That manner or meaning, which supposeth the substance of bread to remain still, is possible: neither



“ is it contrary to reason, or the authority  
 “ of the Scriptures ; nay, it is more easy  
 “ and more reasonable to conceive, if it  
 “ could accord with the determination of  
 “ the Church.”

Fisher, Bishop of Rochester in the time of King Henry the VIIIth, asserts that “ it cannot be proved by Scripture.”

Nor is the silence of Scripture the only argument against this doctrine, since more positive proofs of its inconsistency are amply exhibited in each of those passages which evidently relate to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

If, for instance, plain, positive and repeated words of Scripture, delivered by an infallible interpreter of Christ's own words, in a most solemn and intelligible manner, be sufficient to ascertain any point of doctrine, we shall find the present controversy decided ready to our hands ; for St. Paul, professedly treating of this subject, positively and plainly affirms, that we Christians all partake of *bread* in the Holy Communion, and in the next chapter repeats the same expression three times successively.

*As often, says he, as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death until he come. Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, &c.*

Let

*Let a man examine himself; and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.*

It is then sufficiently evident that these words cannot imply either truth or common sense, unless the substance of bread really remain.

To fancy, with *Bellarmino*, that the Apostle calls the consecrated elements *bread* because it represents the external form thereof, *Tom. ii. lib. 2. de Sacram.* is to offer a dream instead of a solution.

So feeble a distinction not only visibly begs the question, but clashes with the most certain rules of interpreting Scripture. If, because the Apostle, by an easy and familiar figure, once calls the sacrament *the body of our Lord*, it be thence allowed to strain and torture five or six plain assertions to an unnatural and unintelligible sense; if one seemingly obscure expression may be adduced to illustrate the most clear and distinguished texts, we may then forego all farther use of the Bible; the sacred oracles of the God of Truth will become as perplexed as those of Delphi; and a small share of scholastic sophistry may suffice to explain away all sense and divinity. Allowing this strange method of expounding, one may with equal shew of reason conclude that all the *communicants* in the world are substantially changed into *bread*,

and transformed into our Saviour's body, because St. *Paul* says that Christians are *one bread and one body*.

Lastly, the words of the institution of the blessed Eucharist afford us another equally clear and convincing proof against *Transubstantiation*. The Evangelists tell us that our blessed Saviour, at his last supper, *took bread, blessed it, brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, and said, Take eat, this is my body: and then the cup; saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Do this in remembrance of me.*

That then, which Christ gave his Apostles, the Evangelists assure us, was bread; as is plain from the demonstrative pronoun *This*: and since our Saviour calls bread his body, the words must of necessity be understood in a mystical sense: for, as Bellarmine truly, though with an impious comparison, observes, *bread* can no more be the natural body of Christ in a literal and proper sense, than God can be Belial. It follows hence, that bread can no otherwise be Christ's body than in a figurative and sacramental signification: in like manner as the cup is by himself said to be his blood of the New Testament; which cup in the very next verse he represents as the  
fruit

*fruit of the vine*, MARK, xiv. 24, 25. In the last place, whoever consults the writings of the primitive fathers on this subject, will be readily convinced that the words of the institution of the sacrament were never supposed to imply that miraculous change in the elements which the Trent Council, or rather the Pope, through their channel, has thought fit to distinguish with the name of Transubstantiation; but that this doctrine was contrary to the best and purest tradition of the Church in former ages. This has been made to appear in the works of several modern writers on this subject; but by none in a more accurate and satisfactory manner, than by a member of the Roman Communion, in a Treatise of Transubstantiation, printed in London on the eve of the Revolution.

This writer has fully proved, century after century, from the first age of the Christian Church, down to the Council of Trent, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was unknown, or disavowed, by the generality of the learned and orthodox Christians.

The limits of a single discourse confines me to general remarks; but the consequence of these may, nevertheless, be as evident as their certainty is undeniable.



The holy Fathers, to whose decision we pay all due deference, though not so as to esteem it of equal validity with that of the Scripture; these, I say, in their popular discourses have, it is true, spared no words (except that of Transubstantiation) to display the great mystery of the Eucharist; but, if we consult their more exact and accurate compositions, when they come to teach, rather than to declaim, we shall find they will tell us, That these elements are, for their substance, what they were before; bread and wine: that they retain the true properties of their nature, to nourish and feed the body: that they are things inanimate and void of sense: that with reference to the holy sacraments they are images, figures, signs, symbols, memorials and types of the body and blood of Christ. That in the use and benefit they are indeed the very body and blood of Christ to every faithful receiver, but in a spiritual and heavenly manner, as we confess: that in propriety of speech, the wicked receive not in this holy sacrament the body and blood of Christ, although they do outwardly press with their teeth the holy elements, but rather eat and drink the sacrament of his body and blood to their own condemnation.

Thus

Thus Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, in the second century ; Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian in the third ; Eusebius, Basil, Chrysostom in the fourth, speak of being nourished with the food of the Eucharist, and say it consists of an earthly and heavenly part ; that it is the image and figure of his body, and expresses and represents it.

St. Austin, who lived in the fifth century, and is in great esteem in the Roman Church, calls it a figure, and sign of Christ's body and blood ; and says his body is in heaven ; and the sacrament is the resemblance, and representation of it.

" Our Lord (says he) did not scruple to say, *this is my body*, when he gave the sign of his body." Cont. Adamant. c. 12.

In laying down a rule to distinguish the literal and figurative sense of Scripture, he assigns the sacrament as an instance of the latter.

He says expressly that it is a figurative speech, and must be *spiritually understood*.

Theodoret says, he *honoured the symbols with the name of his body and blood ; not changing nature, but adding grace to nature ;* and that they remain in their *former substance, figure and appearance ;* and may be *seen and handled as before*.

Pope *Gelasius*, who lived in the same century, says, it *ceases not to be the substance and nature of bread and wine*, but is the *image and resemblance of Christ's body and blood*. It is often called by later writers the *sacrament of remembrance*, the *pledge of an absent friend*; the *symbols and antitype* of his body.

It is further evident from the liturgies of the Eastern Church, that the Greek Fathers did not believe those words of our Saviour, *This is my body*, to be the words of Consecration, but to be the same in the Holy Eucharist, that the *Haggadah*, or History of the Passion, was in that ancient feast: a bare recital of the occasion and design of the institution of this Blessed Sacrament, not intended to work Miracles in the Consecration. And the African Churches still expound them in such a manner as themselves confess to be inconsistent with Transubstantiation; namely, *This bread is the body of Christ*.

Let it again be considered that it was a great debate in the Primitive Church for above a thousand years, whether Christ's *glorified body* had any *blood* in it or no. How then could the cup of the Eucharist be supposed to be converted into the *blood* of that *body*, which by many was thought to have no blood in it?

To

To this let us add the manner in which the primitive Christians opposed the Hea-thenism of the world. With what shew of candour could they have objected to the worship of gods made with hands, that had neither voice, life nor motion; exposed to decay, to corruption, to dust, to worms, to fire, and other accidents; that were not able to defend themselves from thieves and robbers; but were kept under *locks* and *bolts* to secure them?

Are not the Elements in the Eucharist liable to the same raillery? Is not the wafer of the Romanists made with their own hands? and do not their mouths speak it into a God? Could it defend itself, it need not to be said from public enemies, or private robbers, but from the very vermin and creeping things of the earth? Had again the Christians in former ages believed this great change, how comes it to pass that we find none of those marks or signs of it with which the world has so much abounded since the doctrine of Transubstantiation was started? No talk of accidents existing without *subjects*; of the senses being liable to be deceived in judging of their proper objects; no philosophy, in short, corrupted to maintain this paradox; no adorations, processions, vows paid to the wafer, as to Christ himself? It



was 1240 years before the bell was made use of to give the people notice that they should fall down and worship this new God: The feast in honour of it came in after that; and the adoration of it in the streets is a practice of still later date. But this is not all.

In some Churches, as in that of Jerusalem, they *burnt* what remained of the *Consecrated Elements*. In others, as in that of Constantinople, they gave it to *children* to eat. In some they buried it with their dead. In all, they permitted the communicants to carry home some *remnants* of them. They sent it abroad by sea, by land, from one church and village to another: without any token of adoration, they even sometimes used it for medical purposes, or even mixed the *wine* with their *ink*: all which practices are utterly incompatible with the idea of Transubstantiation.

Lastly, since the promulgation of this doctrine, what opposition has it met with! what schisms has it caused! What disputes have risen about it! who knows not the scandal that has on this account been brought on the Christian world from the reproaches of Jews, Heathens and Mahometans?

What need is there to speak of the troubles of Berenger in the eleventh, of the  
*Waldenses,*

*Waldenses, Albigenes*, and others in the twelfth century? Of Wickliff, Hufs and others who continued the opposition; and finally of the great Reformation in the sixteenth century, by all which this heresy has been opposed and combated ever since it came to be known in the Church? How then is it possible to believe that so many ages should pass, so many heresies should arise, and a doctrine so full of contradiction remain uncontested in the Church for near a thousand years? That Berenger should be one of the first that should begin to credit his *senses*, consult his *reason*, or even to defend his Creed? These are improbabilities which will need more convincing arguments to remove them than the Romanists ever yet have, or it is to be supposed will be able to produce.

Were it necessary to represent the blasphemous absurdity of this doctrine of Transubstantiation in a still stronger light, we need but barely to mention the *intention of the Priest* which the Papists declare to be essentially necessary to all their Sacraments.

By this intention, they mean not so much an attention of the Priest to what he performs, as a general resolution to do what the Church doth. If with this resolution a Priest should pronounce the words of

Consecration in a market, the Papists assure us that he infallibly changes the nature of all the bread there by virtue of such Consecration. But, at the same time, as themselves have furnished us with numberless examples of concealed Jews who had designedly obtained orders, as well as of other sacrilegious Priests who at their deaths have confessed that they had frequently officiated without such intention; as on this direction of intention in the Priest that croud of miracles which are said to be wrought in Transubstantiation must depend; certain it is, that never was idolatry more inexcusable than that of the Romanists in case there be no Transubstantiation. *Coster. Enchir. c. 8.*

To conclude: Thus contrary to sense, to reason, to the testimony of Scripture, and the general consent of the Church in the purest ages of Christianity, is this new doctrine of Transubstantiation; nor can the Romanists with any shew of justice accuse us of regarding the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as no other than a bare commemoration of Christ's death and passion. Let our Catechism, our Articles, and our Communion-office be examined; let the reverence and devotion with which we celebrate this sacred feast be considered: all these will shew how far the Church of England  
is

is from a light estimation of so great a mystery: rather indeed, that it is impossible for any more highly to value and revere it.

Only, my brethren, let our *practice* be conformable to our right apprehensions concerning this Sacrament thus administered amongst us in its purity. As it was appointed to strengthen our union with Christ, and with each other, let us cleave to him by faith, and to each other by love.

In all things let our conversation be as becometh the Gospel of Christ. Though we look not for him upon altars, let us with faith, hope, and patience, expect his second coming in the clouds.

LEC.



## LECTURE V.

MATTH. XXVI. ver. 27, 28.

*And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*

**H**AVING shewn in two preceeding discourses how the Romanists deprave the notion and nature of the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist, by maintaining that the bread and wine are actually converted into that natural and identical body and blood of our Saviour Christ which was born of the blessed Virgin; and that Christ himself is daily offered in the mass, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead; I now proceed to prove that they maim this Sacrament, and make it a half-communion.

So irrational and inconsistent is their conduct in extolling and magnifying this ordinance,

ordinance, beyond all reasonable bounds, by the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass; whilst they impiously reject one half of it by the sacrilegious tyranny of refusing the cup to the people.

That these things are so, we have the decrees of their own Councils, as well as their creeds and catechisms, to convince us. As to the point in question, the Council of Constance in the beginning of the fifteenth century boldly defines, that, although Christ himself administered the Sacrament in both kinds, and though in the primitive Church it had been so administered, yet, this notwithstanding (*hoc tamen non obstante* are their words) the Council appoints that it shall be received by the people but in one kind; and declares those accursed, who teach or practise otherwise: and this decree has since been ratified by the Council of Basil, and that of Trent.

The words of the sixth additional article of Pope Pius's Creed are these—*I do also confess that under either kind or species only, whole and entire Christ, and the true Sacrament is received.*

Innovations in the method of receiving the Eucharist had paved the way for this arrogant decree. The followers of Manichæus,

chæus, a Persian Heretic, who blended the philosophy of his own country with the religion of Christ, took upon them to reject the wine; which impious mutilation was afterwards condemned by Pope Gelasius, who declared it a sacrilegious communion. In the seventh century, the bread was dipped in wine, and thus both kinds were given together: and this in the twelfth century became the general practice; the people thus communicating, as they said, not by authority, but through necessity; for fear of spilling the blood of Christ: a fear unknown to the purer ages of the Church; but suggested by the new doctrine of Transubstantiation.

In consequence of this, a practice was by degrees adopted, of receiving the bread alone; and the Council of Constance afterwards confirmed the custom by enacting a decree, as I have already observed, that the Communion should be administered to the laity but in one kind, which has been a standing law in the Church of Rome ever since. That this is an unwarrantable usurpation over the consciences of men, and that the sufficiency of half-communion is an absurd and indefensible doctrine, will readily appear, whether we consider the proofs from Scripture, together with the institution of our Saviour; the example of  
the

the Apostles, and the subsequent practice of the Church in purer ages; the reasonings, even of the Papists, in support of this their favorite doctrine; or, lastly, the nature of the thing itself.

As it is undeniably evident that, as the Holy Scripture ought to be our only rule in matters of faith, which should be founded on nothing less than a divine Revelation, so, in those of pure, positive, and arbitrary institution, as are the Christian Sacraments, the word of God is our only certain criterion; we must be guided by that, and that only. The Sacraments depend altogether upon the will and pleasure, the mind, and intention of him who appointed them; nor can there, of consequence, be any method of knowing that with more certainty and exactness, than by having immediate recourse to his own institution, lest we mutilate this ordinance by failing in one tittle; rather indeed, lest, through the omission of an essential circumstance of it, we pollute and unhallow the whole Sacrifice.

The institution of the Eucharist then, by our Saviour, we find recorded by three of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke; and by St. Paul, as he received it of the Lord: and from each and every one of these it plainly appears that our Saviour appoints



appoints the cup as well as the bread to be received ; the cup to be drunken, as much as the bread to be eaten. And it is further observable that two of the Evangelists remark that particularly of the cup, which they do not of the bread, that they all drank of it, and that Christ said expressly to them, *Drink ye all of it* ; whence that conjecture may be justly said to be founded on no small degree of probability, that in this particular injunction, our Saviour prophetically regarded those errors which in after-times should take place in the observance of this Sacrament.

First then, let us ask our adversaries whether those words of our Saviour, *Do this in remembrance of me*, do not regard all succeeding Christians, as well as the Apostles themselves ? If not, where then have Christians in general any command to partake of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in either kind ; or to observe that rite which is the peculiar mark and badge of their profession ; the most solemn ordinance in the Christian worship ? But since, on the contrary, it appears from the form of the institution, particularly in the close of it, that all Christians are obliged to receive this Sacrament, and that for the plain and significant reason alledged by St. Paul ; namely, that we do hereby shew the  
Lord's

Lord's death till he come; which entirely coincides with our Saviour's evident design, that it was to be done in memorial of him while absent; it then follows that not only the Apostles, but all succeeding Ministers in the Church of Christ, are hereby commanded to receive, and to dispense to the people this Holy Sacrament of his body and blood, and that this command is equally directed to the people, or Christian laity to receive it, and that in both kinds; since the command of Christ relates to both, and is at least as expressly added concerning the cup, as the bread, beyond all contradiction.

Christ's own institution, had there been no particular command to drink as well as to eat, one would think, should direct us in celebrating this Sacrament, if we intend that it should be the same which he celebrated with his Disciples.

If by it we would exhibit an adequate representation of the Essentials of the great Mystery of our Redemption, we ought doubtless to record the shedding of his blood no less than his body broken; for without shedding of blood, we are told, there is no remission. *But, as St. Cyprian saith, (p. 255.) if it be not lawful to loose any one of the least Commandments of Christ, how much more is it not lawful to infringe so great*  
and

*and so weighty ones, and such as the very Sacrament of our Lord's Passion, and our Redemption; and to change it by human institution into quite another thing than what it is by divine institution! Let us further consider the reason added by our Saviour to his institution and command of, Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for you; as in St. Luke, for many; as in St. Matthew, and St. Mark, for the remission of sins. If the surest way to judge of the extent of any precept, to which a reason is added, is to consider the extent of the reason, and by that to estimate the extent of the precept; then, if all that do communicate stand in need of the remission of sins, as well as a share in the New Covenant, the reason which our Saviour adjoins to the distribution of the cup proves that they ought all to receive it, as having a particular mystical relation to the pouring out or shedding of his blood for the sins of the whole world.*

*This is indeed a privilege peculiar to the Christian Dispensation, and appears to be allowed on the very same account as it was of old forbidden to the Jews; as we read in the Book of Leviticus, xvii. 10, 11. For it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls.*

Since

Since then, without shedding of blood, there is no remission either under the Law, or under the Gospel; since the peculiar virtue and atonement of Christ's Sacrifice is attributed to his Blood, through which *we have redemption, through which we are justified*, and obtain *remission of all our sins*; the practice of drinking wine in the Eucharist in remembrance of the shedding of that blood by which the Sacrifice of Christ our passover is completed, and our redemption sealed, is pointed out and enjoined for the continual observance of all Christians, in this literal command of our Saviour, in words so plain that he who runs may read, and whoever considers them with unprejudiced attention, cannot but understand. *Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; this cup is the New Testament in my Blood which is shed for you: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.* No man, therefore, who is baptized, and leads a suitable life, and is thereby rendered capable of pardon, through the merits of his Redeemer, no such person, whether Ecclesiastic or Layman, can be refused to participate of this great privilege without horrible injustice, as well as a manifest breach of a positive command of Christ. Thus have I endeavoured



voured to prove from particular observances in the Holy Eucharist, as instituted by Christ himself, that, with respect to the point in question, the truth is evidently on our side. Nor need we, a more infallible criterion than the original institution of this Sacrament.

No one would pretend to say that the Sacraments receive their virtue from the nature of the eternal sign, but from divine institution; or that the beneficial effects of those Sacraments are to be obtained or looked for, unless we do our utmost to abide by the original institution; which, unless in cases of necessity, where even the most positive precepts are unquestionably dispensed with, is to be our chief, our primary, and with respect to the essentials of a Sacrament, our only pattern. What those essentials are, and what things are mere accidental circumstances of the ordinance, we may readily learn from the institution itself.

Our Saviour, when he delivered the bread and wine to the Apostles, enjoined the frequent participation of each of these in after-times to them, and in them to all succeeding Christians. He addressed them as his disciples and followers; and the very end for which he declares the ceremony to be appointed, namely, as a memorial of his sufferings,

sufferings, implies the necessity of a frequent repetition of the observance. All Christians, therefore, are under the strictest obligations of complying with our Saviour's injunction, so far as relates to the participation of both the elements in the Lord's Supper; and, in so doing, we fulfil the command of our Lord, as to the essential circumstances of it, but not otherwise. Thus much is evidently implied in these words of St. Paul. *As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's death till he come.*

It was doubtless in our Saviour's power to have instituted other symbols, or to have annexed the whole virtue to either of those which he has chosen: but we are to consider, not what he might have done, but what he has done; and since it is plain that both kinds were instituted by him, it is no less evident that both kinds must be received by us.

Thus Baptism washes away our sins; not because water does naturally cleanse our souls, but because Christ vouchsafed to annex so great a benefit to the due performance of so easy a ceremony.

If he had commanded some great thing, would we not have done it? how much rather then when he saith unto us, *Wash and be clean?*

Thus

Thus also, in participating of the Lord's Supper, in remembrance of his death and passion, we become entitled to the benefits of it: not that the eating of bread and drinking of wine can of themselves make us members of him, or of each other; but because he is faithful that hath promised, and, *according to the mighty working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself*, hath declared that the greatest spiritual blessings, no less than the conquering of vicious habits, and the entire renewal of our souls in grace, shall be the blessed effects of a due observance of that ceremony which he hath ordained.

Other accidental circumstances of the institution of the Lord's Supper we are by no means bound to retain.

To receive the Holy Elements from the hands of an Incarnate God is not now in our power; there is no necessity that the ordinance should be celebrated in an upper room, or after the Paschal Supper; since neither of these are commanded: nor will it be said, that this Sacrament ought to be confined to the male sex, because it does not appear that any women were present at the first institution of it; nor can any reasonable objection be urged against our kneeling at the Sacrament in preference to that reclined posture, in all probability observed.

observed at that time by the Apostles, according to the custom of the Jews at their ordinary repasts; as we cannot now be ignorant of the dignity of that Holy Sacrament, of the important mystery of which the Apostles might not, at the first proposal of it, be fully apprised; according to that of our Saviour to St. Peter on an occasion nearly similar: *What I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter.* Neither again, is it necessary that night should be the time of celebrating, or that twelve should be the precise number of communicants. But though these are circumstantial in which we are not indispensably concerned, any more than we are bound to observe those Pagan superstitions practised by the Roman Church of adding oil, salt and spittle, to the water in Baptism; yet, as no one can forbid water, that those may be baptised, who are capable of receiving the Holy Ghost, as well as we, so neither can any one, without Sacrilege, forbid wine in the Holy Eucharist, to any of the communicants who have already received the Holy Ghost, as well as the Priest who administers.

In a word, as in the Sacrament of Baptism we are obliged to use the element of water, and that only, so in that of the Lord's Supper we are to use the elements both of  

K
bread



bread and wine, and no other. Both these ordinances are sanctified by divine appointment and institution; but both may be annihilated; or, what doubtless is far worse, contaminated and un-hallowed by foreign innovations, or sacrilegious mutilation.

And as the whole analogy of the Sacrament may be destroyed by deviating from our Lord's institution of it, accordingly, we find that the example of the Apostles was entirely correspondent to it.

Thus much we may readily infer from the express words of St. Paul, where he reduces the Corinthians to the first institution; and all along supposes their communicating in both kinds. *As often, saith he, as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.* 1. Cor. xi. 26. *Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* yer. 27. Again, *Let a man* (that is, every man, *whosoever* (as was said before) intends to eat and drink of the Sacramental bread and wine) *examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.* v. 28. The Apostle here evidently speaks in general terms, without making any distinction of ranks or orders of men; and indeed his Epistle is directed to the people, and not to the Ministers of the Church of Corinth:

Corinth: nor can any thing be plainer than it is from a passage in the preceding Chapter of the same Epistle, that the bread and wine (cases of absolute necessity excepted) ought both to be received by the communicants. *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* 1 Cor. x. 16.

From these, and parallel texts, we learn that the practice of the Apostles was conformable to their Lord's institution, and peremptory command. This practice we find abetted and confirmed by the testimony and example of the first and purest ages of the Christian Church; nor is there any one point in which tradition is more express, and more universal, than in this particular, for above a thousand years. If we consult the most ancient rituals, or the earliest accounts which can be obtained of the manner of celebrating the Eucharist in the Christian Church, the first and most authentic of these will be found in Justin Martyr's second Apology, where he describes the public worship of Christians on the Lord's day, according to its true primitive simplicity; and informs us that the Eucharist, which in those days was always a part of the Christian worship, was distributed

buted in both kinds to the *people; to every one that was present.*

The next authority, which I shall adduce for the present purpose, is that of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who in the first of his Mystagogic Catechisms, as they are called, (where he instructs the young Christian in the due performance of the highest Christian mystery, that of the Lord's Supper,) describes the very posture in which the sacred elements ought devoutly to be received: first, as to the bread, and afterwards, no less particularly, as to the manner of receiving the cup.

To St. Cyril, who lived toward the latter end of the fourth century, let us adjoin the Apostolic Constitutions, which, it may be presumed, are not more ancient; and in these the Eucharist is ordered to be celebrated, *the people praying silently, and, after the oblation, every order (namely of young and aged men and women) severally, and by themselves, take the Body and Blood of Christ; and when the women do it in their order* (a custom which obtained in those early times of Christianity) *they are to have their heads covered.* The whole people are even described as partaking *with great reverence* the consecrated elements, and those not collectively, according to the newly devised doctrine of *Concomitancy*, but evidently at distinct

distinct and separate intervals, and from different hands. *The bishop gives the bread, and says, The Body of Christ, and he that receives it says, Amen. The Deacon gives the cup, and says, The Blood of Christ; and he that drinks it says, Amen.* Hence we might appeal to that work which bears the name of St. Dennis the Arcopagite, where the Priest is said to *divide the bread into many parts, and the one cup is, saith he, divided to all.*

As much may likewise be collected from the famous *Ordo Romanus*, which, our great antagonist in this cause, the *Bishop of Meaux*, calls the ancient ceremonial of the Roman Church. But let us proceed to their most ancient liturgies. That under the name of St. Peter represents all the people as partaking of Christ's *immaculate Body, and most precious Blood.* That which bears the name of St. James, mentions *the Deacons after the Communion of the Clergy, taking up both the patens and chalices to give to the people.*

St. Mark's, or the Alexandrian liturgy, plainly directs the Communion in both kinds to all who partake of it; as do likewise those still more authentic ones of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, still in use in the Greek Churches; though both the titles and the authors of these may be very question-



able, yet, with all their interpolations, there is in both of them a manifest proof for the Communion in both kinds: to which may be added that Cassander, in his liturgy, tells us that that of the Æthiopians *agrees with these two, both in the prayers and in the order of the performance.* As to the liturgies of the *Latins*, which they call missals, they have undergone such alterations at *Rome* as were necessary to adapt them to the present opinions and practices of that Church: notwithstanding which, we have many of those which have escaped that usage, and which direct the Communion in both kinds, as appears by the *Codices Sacramentorum*, published at *Rome* by *Thomasius*, where the *Gelasian* form, that is older than the *Gregorian*, speaks of the Priest communicating alike with the sacred orders and with all the people. But the *Sacramentary* of *St. Gregory* is alone sufficient authority for communicating in both kinds, in which the officiating Priest prays, that *as many as shall take the sacred Body and Blood of thy Son may be filled with all heavenly blessings, and we, who take the Communion of this holy bread and cup, are made one Body of Christ.*

All the fathers, without excepting one, speak very clearly of Communion in both kinds, as the universal practice of their times. Ignatius, in one of his epistles,  
says

says plainly, *One bread is broken for all, and one cup is distributed to all.*

Tertullian upon the Resurrection saith the same with Irenæus; *our flesh is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ*: and in two several places the same writer speaks of his wife *taking the cup*. Upon which a very learned critic of the Roman Church hath observed that, at that time, the Supper of the Lord was celebrated in both species. *De la Cerda. Not. 634. The people, saith St. Chrysostom, have as good a right, as the Minister, to the cup: there is no difference between the people and the Priest as to this; one body is offered to all, and one cup.* And even Aquinas, the angelical doctor of the Romanists, speaks of the taking away of the chalice as the practice only of some Churches; nor had the other writers of his time heard of any of these Churches; for they speak of *both kinds* as universally received.

It were, indeed, an endless task to recite the multitude of passages in the writings of the ancient fathers, and primitive doctors, to this purpose.

Gelasius, whom I have already mentioned, Bishop of Rome near the close of the fifth century, declares plainly for both kinds, and saith, the contrary favours of superstition, and will-worship: and what

he declares as to the Sacrilege of dividing one and the same mystery, is inserted into the body of the *canon law*. A remarkable testimony against the practice of the Church of Rome, which allows of the *canon law*! To all this may be added the custom of dipping the bread in the wine, which occasional observance is a further proof that both kinds were thought necessary; as the custom still subsisting in all other churches in the Christian world, except the Roman, of distributing the cup to all, as well as the bread, is a sufficient demonstration of its apostolic and primitive practice, as well as of an universal and uninterrupted tradition for it. Were, indeed, the case otherwise; were it that the Romanists in this instance had tradition on their side, still, what avails that plea when urged in opposition to a divine command, a plain and literal injunction of our Saviour? Surely his answer to the Pharisees, when accusing his Disciples with the neglect of ancient observances, would in this case be not unseasonable; *Why do you also transgress the Commandment of God, by your tradition?* Matth. xv. 3. But here it seems tradition is evidently against them; they find themselves unable to justify their practice of half Communion from the example of the primitive Church, as we learn from the confessions  
of

of their most learned writers. Cassander, for instance, has fully and plainly declared his mind in a particular treatise on this subject.

*Concerning the administration, says he, of the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, it is sufficiently known that the universal Church of Christ, to this very day, and the Western, or Roman, for above a thousand years after Christ, did exhibit both the species of bread and wine to all the members of the Church of Christ, especially in the solemn and ordinary dispensing of this Sacrament, which appears from innumerable testimonies, both of ancient Greek and Latin writers. Cassand. consult. de utr. Spec. Sacr.*

Again, speaking against those who endeavoured to prove, from the authority and practice of the primitive Church, that the use of either one or both kinds was indifferent, he thus seriously and earnestly gives his judgment: *I have searched, says he, and that not slightly, the customs of the ancient Churches, and I profess I have read the writings of those who have handled this argument with an attentive and impartial mind, and have weighed the reasons by which they endeavoured to prove this indifferent custom; but neither could I yet find any firm proof which could not be most plainly refuted, although I most earnestly desired it; but there remain many, and those the most strong reasons,*  
K 5
*which*



*which do evince the contrary.* Were this Writer's authority insufficient, we might readily produce a cloud of witnesses among the learned of their own Communion who concur in the same testimony.

Not only Vicelius, but even Aquinas, the inventor of concomitancy, and, who first proposed the dispute as to the lawfulness of dividing the Sacrament; not Salmeron alone, or Cardinal Bona; but Bellarmine himself owns that Christ instituted, and that the ancient Churches ministered under both species, which custom the testimony of Aquinas is sufficient to prove was continued till the thirteenth century. I shall therefore close this head with the words of a celebrated master in antiquity and learning; *Will any one deny this use of the Eucharistic Communion to have been in both kinds in the time of the Apostles, and that it continued in the Church many ages after? No man can deny or question this, unless he be willing to be reckoned either in the last rank of unlearned, or in the first of imprudent men.* Petav. de poenit. pub. c. 5.

The Romanists, therefore, finding that tradition, their favourite plea, and to which they are ever desirous of having recourse, here thwarts their pretensions, instead of strengthening their cause, are under a necessity of enjoining this refusal of the cup

to the people, by the authority, not of the primitive and Apostolical, but of the present Church; meaning, by that, their own particular Church of Rome, in this instance; among many others, evidently not Catholic.

Hence history informs us that this change in Christ's last solemn appointment, so reproachful to our Lord himself, to his Apostles, and to the ancient and present Church, alarmed the whole Christian world. In Bohemia particularly, when this yoke was preparing to be put on the necks of Christians, John Hus and Jerome of Prague resolutely opposed this daring innovation and sealed the truth with their blood: in consequence of which the Pope found it necessary to grant to the Bohemians a dispensation in this matter, as the only means of preventing their total revolt from him: and from the most authentic records of the Trent Council, we learn that it was then much debated whether the cup should be restored to the laity; but against the stronger reasons that could be urged, the Pope's faction carried it in the negative.

The most specious pretences, with which they have attempted to justify this raging zeal against so plain an institution of Christ, are no other than these.

K 6

They

They say that those who demanded the wine in the Holy Sacrament were disaffected persons, and not true Catholics; and who, so far from being satisfied with this indulgence, would be requiring to have their prayers in a known language, and such other things as the Church could not allow.

They say, if the communicants were allowed the same privileges in the Sacrament with the Priests, that the laity would then be placed too much upon a level with the clergy. Again, They tell us that the Church of Rome cannot err; but that if the Council of Trent had granted, what that of Constance had before prohibited, this would too plainly have proved the contrary; and thereby furnished Hereticks with an argument against their *infallibility*, which would be *an intolerable thing*. Lastly, that some of the communicants, as in case of sickness, or natural antipathy, may have an aversion to wine; or to trifle still further with objections, they urge that the wine, by long keeping in countries where no vines grow, may turn sour.

Had our adversaries produced arguments far more rational than these, a sincere unprejudiced Christian would nevertheless hesitate in obeying the dictates of any sect or communion in defiance of a divine command.

command. But, surely, a moderate share of skill in casuistry will enable us to refute such groundless pleas.

A man, for instance, may possibly be disaffected to the Church, as well as to the Court of Rome, when justly offended at their irregularities, and yet remain a true Catholic : that is, a member of the Universal Church of Christ, as the true sense of the word implies, and as it was always received and understood, till Pope Gregory the seventh, the Tyrannical Hildebrand, as absurdly as arbitrarily, decreed that this general appellation of Catholic should thenceforward be confined to the members of the Church of Rome in particular.

And as to the consequences of admitting prayers in a tongue understood by the people, the advantages which must arise from such a concession towards the edification of all sincere Christians, in true and genuine piety, as well as sincere and rational devotion, are sufficiently apparent to every impartial and unbiassed reasoner; however the undue influence and usurped authority of the Roman Hierarchy might suffer from such an amendment in their rituals.

Before, therefore, they can reasonably apprehend any failure in due subordination of the laity to the Clergy in that Communion,



nion, let them justify, in the opinion of the Christian world, that usurped dominion which they had exercised for ages over the consciences of the deluded people, as well as the temporal Sovereignty of their Pontiff, who pleads his right of succession from one who confessed, *silver and gold have I none*; and would derive an universal despotism over the rights and liberties of mankind from him who declared that his *Kingdom was not of this World*. As to the probability of their Church being thought capable of erring, this caution comes by far too late; since it is not possible that their pretended infallibility can suffer more from any subsequent inconsistencies than it has already been known to have done, times without number.

Of the truth of this assertion, every decree of one Pope or Council in direct opposition to that of a preceding one, of which history affords us examples in every century, is a sufficient proof. In the very case before us we have an undeniable testimony ready to our hands, unless the Romanists can reconcile the refusal of the cup to the people, with that decree of a preceding Pope, *Gelasius*, whom I have already mentioned; equally infallible, it is presumed, with any of his successors, which stands thus recorded, that whosoever re-  
fused

fused to partake of the cup, should be forbid  
 the wine also. With regard to the last  
 mentioned objection, that some in many  
 thousands possibly may have an antipathy to  
 wine, that a sick person may loath it, or that  
 a difficulty may arise in obtaining or pre-  
 serving it in distant countries, not to say  
 that the same objection might be urged  
 against the participating of the bread; these  
 are singular and extraordinary cases, to  
 which, as I have before observed, the most  
 positive appointments must of necessity  
 give way; they may indeed be represented  
 as occasional exceptions to, but cannot,  
 with justice or propriety, be supposed to  
 invalidate the original order of Christ's in-  
 stitution of the Eucharist, as to the general  
 observance of it. To which might be  
 added, that the very idea of the consecrated  
 wine turning sour in being conveyed to  
 communicants at a distance, is by no means  
 compatible with that of Transubstantiation;  
 as, upon that supposition, it were no less  
 than to say, that the blood of our glorified  
 Saviour should *see corruption*. An idea  
 surely far more intolerable than any of  
 those inconveniences which our adversaries  
 would be thought to apprehend. Consci-  
 ous, therefore, as it may seem, of the inva-  
 lidity of these objections, they produce  
 from Scripture what they would have to be

be looked upon as examples of a similar practice, with a view to justify their mutilation of this Sacrament. The first instance which they alledge of the celebration of the Eucharist with bread only, is that of our Saviour, when he made himself known to his Disciples at Emmaus; *their eyes were opened because he was known of them in breaking of bread.* Luke xxiv. 31,—35.

All that can be proved from these words of the Evangelist is, that our Saviour did not think proper to make himself known to the Disciples till immediately before his departure from them; for in the very next words it is recorded, that *he vanished out of their sight*: He made himself known to them in breaking of bread, which he possibly might have done by observing that deportment towards them, which, during his former intercourse with them, he had ordinarily practised, and they might well recollect.

The ceremony of breaking of bread, and blessing it; of looking up to Heaven, and giving thanks, is by no means annexed solely to the celebration of the Eucharist; unless, as in the opinion of the sect called Quakers, who presume that they receive the Sacrament whenever they eat or drink. Imploring a blessing on God's creatures for our use, and the daily remembrance of him

him, as the giver of all good gifts, at their ordinary repasts, has been the uniform and avowed practice of all sincere and devout Christians, from the earliest times of the Gospel.

Thus did St. Paul to the shipmen and soldiers in a storm at sea, when he recommended what he gave them as meat for their health, and because, as he said, they had continued long fasting: And thus did our Saviour himself, at two distinct times, when he distributed the loaves and fishes to the multitudes, before the Sacrament of his last Supper was instituted.

Those, therefore, of our adversaries who are willing to maintain, that our Saviour did certainly administer the Eucharist to his Disciples at Emmaus, must at the same time grant, though it is not recorded in the Gospel, that he as certainly consecrated it in both kinds, since the Church of Rome itself declares it to be no Sacrament unless the officiating Priest consecrates and receives both bread and wine. In this instance, therefore, according to the very principles of the Romanists, the Eucharist must have been celebrated in both kinds, or not at all. The same may be alledged in answer to what has been adduced from the Acts of the Apostles, where breaking of bread, and meeting together to break bread,



bread, is represented as the frequent practice of the Disciples in those days; besides all which, it is well known that breaking of bread is a comprehensive term equivocal to those in more ordinary use of dining and supping; that is, implying the whole of an ordinary repast, or even of a sumptuous entertainment. Thus our Saviour went to eat bread at the Pharisee's house: and thus it is doubtless to be understood, when it is said that Joseph's Brethren went to eat bread with him: and the observance of the Paschal Supper, in which ordinance they drank likewise, is expressed by *eating* the Passover.

If again it be urged that though the Apostles were commanded to receive in both kinds, yet that we are not obliged to receive the wine as well as the bread; from this argument, if it could prove any thing, we might conclude, that Christians in general were not obliged to receive the Sacrament in either kind. And further, when with a view to make it appear that this command of our Saviour is only conditional, the Romanists would avail themselves of our Saviour's injunction, in the words of St. Paul, *Do this, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me*; we are to remember that conditions, thus expressed, do not take away the absolute necessity of the duty,

duty, but only point out the manner of the performance. Thus *when* we give alms, our Saviour tells us that we are not to blow a trumpet before us; *when* we pray, not to use vain repetitions. *Keep thy foot, says the Preacher, when thou goest to the House of God.* Eccles. v. 1. But he must surely be a very unskilful disputant who would attempt to argue from the intimations, that we are at liberty to omit the duties of prayer and alms-giving. But still, it is plain, say they, that the Apostle puts a difference between eating and drinking, when he says, *Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup, &c.* as if one might be done without the other. But besides that other copies, such as the Alexandrian MS. and the Syriac and Arabic translations, read *and*, instead of *or*, it is sufficiently observable that these two particles are frequently used as of equivocal signification both in the Old and New Testament. To mention only the latter, *By what authority doest thou these things, or who is he that gave thee this authority?* says St. Luke xx. 2. but the other Evangelists, relating the same question, have the same words, except using *and* for *or*. When again our Saviour says, that he came not to destroy the law or the prophets, it is plain that he means the law and the prophets, which we find always spoken of together,

gether, in that manner, in other places of Scripture. To suppose, indeed, that by the use of this particle *or* in this passage the Apostle had any design to distinguish away the necessity of receiving the cup in the Sacrament, is to make him absolutely inconsistent with himself; for it is in the same Chapter where he says, *as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup,* 1 Cor. xi. 26. *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.* v. 28. and again, *He, that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself,* v. 29. That very verse, indeed, upon which this argument of our adversaries is founded, teaches the same thing; for the words of the Apostle run thus, *Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.* v. 27. He is supposed to receive both, because he is said to be guilty of profaning both.

But lastly, since it is evident that there are plain texts in Scripture which enjoin Communion in both kinds, it were a vain attempt to shelter ourselves under a seemingly difficult passage; and by that means think to obtain a liberty of breaking God's positive law. I shall therefore dwell no longer on this tedious and needless piece of criticism; but proceed to examine the

two favourite pleas, by which the Romanists would justify the refusal of the cup to the people; I mean the exclusive privilege of the Priests, as representing the Apostles, who they pretend were then made pastors; and lastly, the *trick of consecrancy*, as Archbp. Tillotson calls it. By the former of these pretences, they daringly deprive the communicants of one half of the Sacrament; by the latter, they would sooth their credulous votaries into a persuasion, that they receive the Blood when they take the Body of Christ; the wine with the wafer; or in other words, that they drink, when they only eat.

To begin with the first of these; if it were true that the Apostles received the cup as Priests, and not merely as Believers, why do the Romanists, even on this supposition, presume to vary from what they would maintain to have been Christ's first institution? Why do they not administer the cup to every Ecclesiastic, who communicates, instead of reserving it solely to the Priest who consecrates? for we learn from the words of the institution that our Saviour said, *Drink ye all of this, and that they all drank of it.* But if, on the contrary, our Saviour may more rationally be supposed to act as an officiating Priest, whilst the Apostles, (this transaction being prior



prior to their ordination as pastors) represented, as communicants, the whole body of Christian believers who should partake of the Eucharist in after times, then is it certain, that Church, or Sect, must plainly err from Christ's original institution of the Sacrament, which refused the cup to any of the faithful who communicate; since it is equally, one might even say, more strictly and particularly enjoined, than the participation of the bread, in the delivering of which to the Disciples our Saviour's words, *Take eat, this is my body which is given for you, Do this in remembrance of me*, are not so full, strong and emphatical as when, in giving the cup, he says, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins; do this, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me*. The same argument therefore that is brought to prove it unnecessary for lay communicants to receive the cup, must prove likewise, *a fortiori*, that they need not partake of the bread, and consequently, that it is not necessary that they should receive either.

This I say, must be granted, even upon the supposition of the Apostles becoming Priests by virtue of those words of our Saviour, *Do this*, pronounced, probably, before

fore they had received the bread; but we reasonably conclude before they had eaten it. But that the ordination of the Apostles at this time is altogether a groundless notion will appear, if we recollect the gross absurdities which must follow that supposition. The Romanists maintain that Ordination is one of the Christian Sacraments: if so, Christ not only administered two Sacraments in one, when he administered the Eucharist to the Apostles; but it must likewise, in that case, be granted, that the Apostles were at that time twice ordained; and once more after our Saviour's resurrection, when he manifestly commissioned them to the exercise of the ministerial function, in these memorable words, *Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.*

But, to solve the business more readily, and to render the practice of half-communion more palatable to their votaries, the doctrine of concomitancy was invented by Thomas Aquinas; which device would seem to imply that the blood, being necessarily contained in the body of Christ, is received together with the consecrated bread, which Transubstantiation tells us is the identical Body of Christ that suffered on the cross. As this doctrine of concomitancy is evidently founded on Transubstantiation,

stantiation, it cannot possibly have any weight with those who disbelieve the latter: but, granting for a moment that there could be truth in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, even upon that supposition it does by no means follow, that the blood of Christ in the consecrated bread is taken as it should be, that is, Sacramentally. The very notions of eating and drinking are confounded; we cannot be said to drink of the cup as our Saviour ordained that we should, when we eat of the bread only, even though that bread were dipped in wine, as has been sometimes practised: nor do we, in that case, Sacramentally commemorate, by an adequate representation, the effusion of that precious Blood which was shed for the sins of the whole world.

A devout Christian, it is true, may receive Christ by a single act of faith, as his own declaration implies, *He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.*

But he who is desirous of receiving Christ Sacramentally, must exercise distinct acts of faith on him, as represented by those two different visible signs, which are appointed by him to be distinctly partaken of. Were, again, the cup unnecessary, our Saviour must have appointed what is superfluous, and consequently improper, which it were impious to suppose; and

if i  
be  
the  
alre  
the  
fible  
self.  
we  
Sac  
fists  
use  
in th  
and  
U  
the c  
ther  
trifli  
of d  
prev  
and  
to n  
of n  
these  
ly be  
have  
to be  
nerin  
hat i  
Saint  
roke  
Be

if it be necessary for the priest, there can be no reason why it is not as much so for the people. To conclude, what has been already offered is sufficient to prove that the practice of half-communion is indefensible even from the nature of the thing itself. It is from the institution only, that we can learn what are the essentials of a Sacrament, and of how many parts it consists: so that if we expect a blessing in the use of this ordinance, we must celebrate it in that manner which is prescribed to us, and in no other.

Upon the whole, let the unprejudiced, the candid, and the intelligent, decide whether it is fitting that the groundless pleas, trifling evasions, or sophistical arguments of designing men, should be allowed to prevail so far as to disannul the last Will and Testament of our dying Saviour, and to make his literal and express command of none effect. Rather, indeed, do not these shallow and vain cavillings manifestly betray the weakness of their cause? and have we not the greatest reason cautiously to beware of their error, by faithfully adhering to those ordinances, together with that faith which was once delivered to the Saints, that we be not entangled with any yoke of bondage?

Be thankful, then, my brethren, that you

L

have



have the privilege to partake of the Sacrament in that way which Christ ordained.

Whilst you condemn the Romanists for the practice of half-communion, do not, by negligence, or an immoral conduct, deprive yourselves of the benefit of the whole. Frequent the holy table, as you have opportunity, with a becoming reverence, and when duly prepared for that Evangelical feast ; and do your utmost that your profiting by it may appear, both to yourselves and others.

## LECTURE VII.

## I. JOHN I. 7.

*The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.*

BY the *blood of Christ* we are to understand his death, which was the natural consequence of shedding his blood; and this expression seems directly to import a *sacrificial purgation*, or being pardoned by way of atonement, or in view to an expiatory sacrifice; such a *forgiveness* as is a *cleansing from all unrighteousness* by the blood of the Son of God; for it is that which *cleanseth us from all sin*.

Thus says St. John; but in direct contradiction to this inspired writer, as well as to the plain declaration of St. Paul to the Hebrews, that Christ had by himself purged our sins, the Romanists of these latter

days have taken upon them to preach another Gospel, and enjoin the belief of the doctrine of Purgatory, as indispensably necessary to the salvation of every Christian. The words of the seventh additional article of the Trent Creed are these; *I stedfastly believe that there is a Purgatory; and that the souls detain'd therein are helped by the prayers of the faithful.* For the better understanding of this, we are to observe that the doctrine of Purgatory imports that the souls of the best men, but very few excepted, immediately after their departure from the body, find themselves in a most wretched condition, since they are supposed to endure the sharpest pains that a fire, burning seven times hotter than any we know of, can convey to a sensible being.

In the opinion of the Romanists, it is, it seems, necessary that those who die before they have made full atonement to God for their greater sins; or without having repented of such ordinary failings as they take upon them to distinguish by the name of venial sins; that such must go to a subterraneous region, there to suffer torments, equal to those of the damned, till they are utterly cleansed from their unrepented sins, by what is called in the Trent Catechism *a purgatorial fire.* Not that they pretend that these sufferings are for the moral purification

ification of sinners, as the sense of the word would naturally lead us to understand, and as the afflictions of this life are allowed to be; for this they absolutely deny; but for a cleansing, by way of *satisfaction* to the Divine justice. Nevertheless, for reasons hereafter to be mentioned, they forget not to add, that souls in this distress are to be helped by the suffrages of the faithful; that is, by prayers and alms offered for them; and principally by the Sacrifice of the mass, and Papal indulgences. Such is the account given by Cardinal Bellarmine, the great oracle of the Roman Church: so that, according to them, Purgatory is a dreadful prison, the contrivance of which would have manifested an inexhaustible fund of cruelty, as well as unexampled industry in the architects, had they not found a way to open its gates, by acquainting the people with sure methods of regaining their liberty, without much loss of time. These means, as I have already intimated, are the obtaining indulgencies, from the Pope's treasure of the merits of departed Saints, who, it seems, had more virtue than was necessary for their own purposes.

And chiefly it is recommended by the leaders of that Communion, that those who die rich, instead of indulging an ill-judged tenderness for their surviving relations,



should, for the relief of their own souls, when in Purgatory, bequeath considerable legacies to the clergy, for masses to be said for them. Nor need any be astonished at the multiplicity of business which seems to devolve upon the priesthood, in consequence of this doctrine, since it is well known that, to obviate such inconveniences, a compendious method of devotion has been long since devised by the Roman Hierarchy; there being, in most countries under their jurisdiction, what are called privileged altars, by virtue of which privilege, granted for valuable considerations, the Pope decrees that one mass said at such an altar, shall pass for hundreds performed in any other place.

If we trace this dream of Purgatory to its true origin, we shall find it to be no other than a remnant of Paganism. To justify this assertion we might produce the authority of writers several centuries antecedent to the Christian æra.

Of this Virgil, *Æn.* 6. Plato, in *Gorg.* *Phædr.* *Timæo*; and, to go still further back in the annals of prophane story Homer himself. *Odyss.* 12. affords us sufficient testimony that Purgatory, whatever alterations it may have since undergone from the refinements of modern superstition, unquestionably took its rise among the Gentiles.

Gentiles ; and that the Pagan poets and philosophers first presented it to the world. Agreeably to this, St. Austin tells us (de Civit. l. 7.) *that the Terminalia* (a festival of the old Romans, appointed by Numa) *were celebrated in the same month of February, when the purgatory sacrifice was made, from which the month took its name. viz Februa ; à serveo, quod igne facta propriè essent.*

Not to recite the errors of Origen as to this matter, which, though condemned as heretical by the Fifth General Council, continued in some degree to prevail for some centuries after, it may suffice to observe that the Roman doctrine of Purgatory, in that preposterous form of impious absurdity in which it has since been obtruded upon the credulous votaries of that communion, had not the least foundation in the Primitive Church.

About 600 years after Christ, Pope Gregory the Great first began to patronize it. Pretended apparitions, and visions of departed souls, operating on the minds of the superstitious, in a time of singular ignorance and barbarism, greatly fostered the error, which by degrees was artfully introduced, and established, to support the practice of praying for the dead, which from the feeble support which it received from those opinions of the primitive Fathers, upon

which it was first established, began daily to loose ground. To revive the spirit of so lucrative a practice, and on which the sale of masses, and consequently in a great measure the patrimony of the Roman Church depended, miracles, and messages from the dead, were readily framed, to forward the cheat of Purgatory: The flames of *Ætna* and *Vesuvius*, were pointed out as pregnant proofs of the reality of its torments; and even the very roads to purgatory were now said to be discovered; one in Sicily, one in Pozzueto, and a third in Ireland.

Thus the belief of a purgatorial fire took place in the Roman Church, in the 6th, 7th, and 8th, centuries; but was by no means settled as an article of faith, till the Council of Florence in 1439. Nor has this doctrine been clearly explained, even by the Trent Council, though it has peremptorily decreed that the belief of it is necessary to Salvation.

But since the Romanists suppose that nothing is to be brought into this dispute but what is defined by the Council of Trent, let the question be stated according to their own desire, and let us enquire only, in the words of Cardinal Bellamine, “whether there be any such place in which, “as in a prison, the souls are purged after  
“ this

“ this life which were not fully purged  
 “ before; that so being cleansed, they  
 “ may be able to go into Heaven, where  
 “ no unclean thing shall enter”.

The Cardinal's own method of arguing  
 is this; “ There are some sins, in their  
 “ own nature venial, and worthy only of  
 “ a *temporal punishment*. But it is possible  
 “ a man may depart out of this life with  
 “ such only, therefore it is necessary that  
 “ he be purged in another life.” To this  
 it may be answered, that the supposition is  
 false, and the conclusion inconsequent.  
 We allow that every sin deserves punish-  
 ment, seeing it is a transgression of the  
 law.

We grant that all transgressions of the  
 Law are not equally heinous; and parti-  
 cularly, that there is a vast difference be-  
 tween the common infirmities of good  
 men, and the guilt of those who offend  
 through malicious wickedness. But that  
 any sin is in its own nature venial, so as  
 not to deserve eternal punishment, as an  
 offence against the infinite justice of God,  
 should he be extreme to mark what is done  
 amiss by the most perfect of men; to this  
 we cannot agree, till we have some plainer  
 proof than has ever yet been adduced, that  
 there are some acts of disobedience to our  
 Creator,



Creator, which he cannot justly punish eternally.

What actions are sinful, and what punishments are due to our sins, we can learn only from the Holy Scriptures; and we are therein plainly told, that *the wages of sin is death*: And that, according to the rigour of the law, *every one is accursed that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them*.

St. John, indeed, tells us, that *there is a sin, unto death, and there is a sin not unto death*: but we have no authority from hence to pronounce that any sin is, of itself, worthy of pardon; for in the sight of God, we are told, *shall no man living be justified*. That distinction therefore of sins into venial and mortal, long since devised by the Roman Church, is contrary to the plainest declaration of Scripture, and is of itself a contradiction in terms. Whatever is venial is worthy of pardon, if the word has any meaning; and therefore, cannot, with propriety, be said at the same time to deserve punishment: to which might be added that, in the Roman catalogue, many sins are declared to be venial, which, in the opinion of any unprejudiced person, and from the notices which are afforded us in Scripture, that they who commit such things shall in no wise enter the Kingdom of Heaven

Heaven, appear to be crimes of the deepest dye. Not drunkenness only, (Toletus instr. sacerd. viii. 61. Aquinas. Cajetan. Sanchez. mor. l. 1. c. 16. n. 44.) uncleanness, (Navarre. manual. c. 16. n. 8. Sylvester. verb. pollut. Lopez. c. 74.) or covetousness, (Cajetan. summ. verb. avaritia.) which is idolatry; but distrust of God. (Angelus. summ. verb. sollicitud.) dealing with the Devil, (Sylvester. summ. verb. adjurat. n. 3. Angelus. 8. V. Superstitio. n. 3. Cajetan & Navarre de adjurat. Aureolus in 4. dist. 34. 9. 2.) blasphemy, (Sylvest. S. V. blasphem. n. 4. Aquinas 2. 2. 9. 13. a. 2. Lopez. c. 15.) and even hatred of God (Navarre manual. c. 11. n. 18.) are in several instances, and under certain restrictions and palliations, accounted by the casuists of the Roman Church, not only venial sins, but sometimes acts of virtue, and meriting reward, instead of punishment. (Cajetan. S. V. divinatio. Sylvest. S. V. superstitio. n. 10. Tolet. instr. sacerd. iv. 14. Filiucius. tr. 24. c. 7. n. 170.) But were there even any grounds for this supposition, that some sins are venial, how does it from hence follow that these must of necessity be punished in another life? or, in other words, with what reasons will our adversaries prove, that, if the justice of God may deliver be-  
 lievers

Hevers from the pains of eternal death, he may not, on the same account, remit all temporal penalties, and receive them immediately into a state of rest, without first punishing them, as it were, merely for the sake of punishing, and that with torments inferior in nothing, but in their duration, to those of Hell itself?

On the contrary, *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord; even so saith the Spirit; for they rest from their labours.* Jesus Christ, we are plainly told, is the propitiation for our sins; for God hath laid on him the iniquities of us all. So that if the justice of God is satisfied by the sufferings of his Son, there can then be no need of further satisfaction; if it be true that *the blood of Christ cleanse us from all sin*, there can need no other Purgatory.

By the new covenant, God's grace and pardon is extended, without further limitation, to those who believe and repent: *their sins and iniquities he will remember no more: being justified by faith, they have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*; and on these reasons we may justly conclude, that the doctrine of temporal punishment to be inflicted on the righteous, in another life, is highly derogatory to the Divine attributes of grace and mercy, so amply displayed in the dispensation of the new covenant,

venant, directly contrary to those full offers of pardon, peace and oblivion, which are rendered to mankind in the Gospel, as well as to the truth and veracity, the justice and goodness, of the Almighty. To affirm that there are reserves to be understood for punishment, when the offers and promises are made to us in such large and unlimited expressions, is such an idea of infinite love, mercy, and goodness, as can never be the dictate of right reason, but, on the contrary must be condemned as utterly inconsistent with it.

But tradition is brought in, as usual, to support this hypothesis; and with their accustomed fertility of invention, the leaders of the Roman communion have furnished their votaries with an endless variety of entertaining narratives, as appears by their legends; (see *Speculum Exemplorum*) interesting, no doubt, as they are supposed to be reported by souls in Purgatory. Such for instance, was the tale of St. Hierom appearing to Eusebius, related in an epistle imputed to St. Cyril; whereas, (unfortunately for the inventor of this story;) St. Hierom outlived St. Cyril, and wrote his life; which, it is presumed, is a sufficient confutation of it. But to such arguments as these, if they have none more convincing, it may be answered, that the Scriptures



Scriptures expressly forbid us to inquire of the dead, for truth; *for all that do these things are an abomination to the Lord.* Deut. xviii. 11, 12, &c.

*To the law and to the testimony,* (saith the Prophet) *if they speak not according to the Word, it is because there is no light in them.* II. viii. 20.

If men bear not Moses and the Prophets, (saith our Saviour) *neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead*; and to shew that no new doctrine ought to be framed upon the authority of such a revelation, St. Paul, on this subject expresses himself in terms so apposite to our present purpose, that we might even suppose him declaring his sentiments to a conventicle of modern Romanists, on the subject of Purgatory. *I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Christ, unto another Gospel; which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an Angel from Heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.* Gal. i. 6, 7, 8. Consonant to this was the opinion of many of the primitive Teachers of the Church, (Tert. Athan. Chrysost. Isidor. Theophylact.) that if any dependence was placed on relations from an invisible

visible world, the devils, under that pretence, might easily abuse the world with revelations of their own framing. But we have not so learned Christ. *God hath, we know, in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, of whom he hath likewise proclaimed, by a voice from heaven, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.* Matth. xvii. 5. That the Greek Church did always dissent from the Latins, in this point of doctrine, as being forged in the laboratories of Rome, is sufficiently known, In the Council of Basil they published an apology directly disapproving the Roman doctrine of Purgatory. And it is equally notorious that, when afterwards pressed in the Council of Florence, by Pope Eugenius, and by their own necessity, they consented unwillingly, answered ambiguously, and protested against having that half consent inserted in the instrument of union; which union they afterwards dissolved: and to this day refuse to own this doctrine. For a confirmation of the truth of this, we have the testimony of one of Rome's champions, and Luther's great antagonist, the Cardinal of Rochester; "The doctrine of Purgatory was rarely, if at all, heard of among the ancients, and to this very day the Greeks believe it not". Act. 18. Upon the same principles we find all the

the ancient Fathers of the Church proceeded : they thought that the just, when departed, went immediately into a *state of happiness* : that it was injurious to Christ to hold that such as died in his faith were to be pitied ; that Christians therefore ought not by any means to be afraid of dying.

“ It is for him, says St. Cyprian, to fear death, that is unwilling to go to Christ. It is for him to be unwilling to go to Christ, who doth not believe that he begins to reign with Christ. Simeon said, Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace ; proving and witnessing that the servants of God then have peace, then enjoy free and quiet rest, when, being drawn from the storms of this world, we arrive at the haven of our everlasting habitation and security. Let us therefore embrace the day that brings every one to his own house, which, having taken us away from hence, and loosed us from the snares of this world, returns us to Paradise, and to the Kingdom of Heaven”. Cypr. de Mortalitat.

And again “ When we go hence, (says the same Holy Father) “ There is no place for repentance, no effect of satisfaction. Here life is lost or won ; here  
“ pro-

"provision is made for eternal life by the  
 "service of God, and the fruit of faith.  
 Ad Demetrian. § 22.

St. Dionysius calls the extremity of death,  
 τέλος ἡρώων ἀγωνῶν, the end of all our ago-  
 nies; and affirms that "the holy men  
 "of God rest in joy, and in never-failing  
 "hopes, and are come to the end of their  
 "holy combats." Eccles. Hier. c. 7.  
 "Justin Martyr affirms that, "When the  
 "soul is departed from the body, imme-  
 "diately there is a separation made of the  
 "just and unjust. The unjust are, by angels,  
 "borne into places which they have de-  
 "served; but the souls of the just into  
 "Paradise, where they have the conversa-  
 "tion of angels and archangels," Quest.  
 & Resp. ad Orthod. qu. 5.

St. Ambrose declares his belief, that  
 "death is a haven of rest, and makes not  
 "our condition worse; but according as  
 "it finds every man, so it reserves him to  
 "the judgement that is to come". De bono  
 mortis, cap. 4. The same is affirmed by  
 St. Hilary, St. Macarius and several others.  
 In Ps. 2. Hom. 22. They speak but of  
 two states after death, of the just, and the  
 unjust: these are placed in horrible regions,  
 reserved to the judgement of the great day;  
 the souls of the former are carried, by choirs  
 of angels, into places of rest. Gregory Na-  
 zianzen.



zianzen says, "After the night of this life  
"there is no purging." In Pasch. Orat. 42.

Our adversaries, it seems, have availed  
themselves of some passages in the wri-  
tings of St. Austin, which imply, as they  
pretend, his belief of a purgatorial state  
in another life: but let us hear his own  
words on this subject. "The faith of Ca-  
"tholics, says he, by Divine authority,  
"believes the first place to be the Kingdom  
"of Heaven; the second place to be Hell,  
"where every apostate, or infidel, shall be  
"punished everlastingly: a third place  
"we are utterly ignorant of, neither shall  
"we find it in the Holy Scriptures." L. 5  
Hypognos. ultra med. And whereas the  
Romanists make a groundless distinc-  
tion between Christ's redeeming us from  
the guilt, and his redeeming us from the  
punishment of sin, St. Austin, on the con-  
trary, tells us, "Our Lord Jesus Christ came  
"to die, he came not to sin; and by sha-  
"ring the pain with us, without the guilt  
"he has delivered us both from the guilt,  
"and the pain.

Pope Gelasius himself writes, "That he  
"had read of the right hand, and of the  
"left, but knew of no third place:" And  
"moreover declares that "Christ gave no  
"power to his church to absolve any man  
"after

"after he was dead." Epif. 7. Bin. Tom.  
 "2. par. 1.

Lastly, on the score of indulgences, for the relief of souls in Purgatory, Salvian informs the faithful, that "if a son were so pious, that, to ease his father's pains, he would give most of what he left him, it would do no good." On this head I shall only add, that several of the most ancient fathers believed, the souls of the faithful, not only to enter into happiness after their departure, but to be carried immediately into Heaven: Athenagoras Legat. pro Christianis Cypr. de Mortal. Orig. Contr. Cels. Greg. Naz. Or. 10. Tom. 1. Chrysost. Cyril. Alex. in Joan. 19. 30. l. 12. To. 4. Hier. Ep. 25. &c. that they utterly deny the soul to be capable of being purged in another world; and what militates no less powerfully against the modern notion of Purgatory amongst the Romanists, is that these primitive Doctors of the Church take no notice of this doctrine in such places as, had they believed it, they could not well have omitted it, namely, in their creeds, or Councils, or chatechetical discourses, in which the other articles of their faith are set down and explained.

Let us next examine that evidence which our adversaries alledge from Holy Writ, in defence of this their favoured doctrine, which,  
 of

if confirmed by plain passages in Scripture, ought doubtless to be attended to: but this cannot be expected, if their proofs appear to be no more than strained arguments, drawn from some obscure texts, purposely wrested to serve a present turn, and such as no man would ever have thought to be to the purpose, if he had not first taken the doctrine for granted. When, for instance, some of the Romanists pretend, that the flaming sword, mentioned Gen. iii. 24. was a witness to sinners, that they must pass through Purgatory to Paradise, this remark may happen to remind us of those more cogent arguments of fire and sword, with which the leaders of their communion have too frequently endeavoured to obtrude their errors, upon such as dared not to oppose them; but it were evidently absurd to say, that the passing through Purgatory, or any known or unknown region, bears an adequate analogy to the circumstance of cherubim, and a flaming sword, being placed at the gate of the garden of Eden, purposely to prevent any entrance at all.

It will scarcely be thought necessary that I should take notice of all those places in Scripture, which, though some of them have alledged, yet the more learned among the Romanists have freely confessed to be  
foreign

foreign to the purpose. Cardinal Bellarmine has collected, for the proof of the doctrine in question, no less than 19 several texts; but at the same time confesses that all, at least out of the Old Testament except one, (which as it more immediately relates to the practice of praying for the dead, I propose to consider, in the close of this Discourse,) amount, in reality, to no more than *probable arguments*. Of these 16 are rejected by Alexander Natalis, besides one which he omits as impertinent, by Bellarmine's own confession. I propose, nevertheless, in the sequel of this Discourse, to take notice of those passages in Scripture, which they lay most stress upon, and which are as follow: The Psalmist says, (66. 11.) *we went through fire and water*: alluding, not improbably, to the burning of Mount Sinai. Ex. xix. 16. together with the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, mentioned in the same Psalm; if not in general to the temporal evils which they had in a miraculous manner escaped. But if, according to the Roman casuistry, we ought to suppose Purgatory is signified wherever mention is made of fire and water, let us but place this passage, together with another, which is brought from the Old Testament, to prove the same doctrine, and we shall find that they directly contradict each other:



other : for the prophet Zachary speaks of the wretched condition of the children of Zion, under the name of a *pit wherein is no water*, c. ix. 11. This likewise is brought by Bellarmine, as a proof of the existence of Purgatory, how little soever it agrees with his own description of that unknown region, as alluded to, in his opinion, in the former passage. To which the answer of one of their most zealous champions, already mentioned (Fisher, bishop of Rochester) will suffice for both ; “ I approve  
 “ not, says he, such trifling as this, which  
 “ explains this place of Purgatory.

But to proceed : The prophet Malachi tells us, c. 3. that the messenger of the covenant shall suddenly come to his temple, *and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver* : that is, Christ shall teach his followers purity of heart, and sincerity ; purging away the dross of carnal ordinances, that they may offer to God such services as are truly acceptable to him.

In this sense the spirit of Christ, by which he is said to purify us from our corruption, is frequently, by the Prophet, styled the spirit of fire, and the spirit of burning, as in the 4th of Isaiah, v. 4. which passage is also alledged for the confirmation of  
 this

this doctrine of Purgatory; but with what grounds let Bellarmine decide, who, in this very argument, acknowledges, that the refining here mentioned relates merely to the living. So that he may as rationally infer the dead to be living, as from this purifying of the living, by the spirit of God, to conclude a purging and satisfying for the sins of the departed in another state. Such are some of their arguments from the Old Testament, in proof of the existence of a purgatorial fire; in which, if there were any truth, we might reasonably expect, in the New Testament at least, much plainer intimations of so important an article of faith, than can possibly be collected from the following texts, which, the Romanists boast, are amply sufficient to confirm their hypothesis.

*Agree with thine adversary quickly whilst thou art in the way with him, least at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.*  
Matth. v. 25. 26.

If we consider the design of this whole chapter, which was an enforcement of all those Christian virtues whereby we might secure to ourselves peace and comfort in  
this

this world, and eternal felicity in the next, there can be no impropriety in understanding this passage in a literal sense. Thus Bellarmine himself acknowledges; thus St. Chrysostom expounded it; as did St. Jerom, St. Basil, and Theophylact.

In the opinion of these primitive Fathers, therefore, it is plain that the doctrine of Purgatory could gain no countenance from this text, where the offender is threatened with commitment to an earthly prison, and not to a place of temporal punishment in another world.

St. Cyprian's interpretation implies an allusion to the rigour of church discipline, in those days, which was exercised in the infliction of bodily penance, mortification, or other voluntary austerities, to be submitted to in this life. An idea which tends more to confute, than to confirm the notion of purgatorial penance hereafter.

But many writers of the Roman church have rendered this passage in an allegorical sense, amongst whom Maldonate, the Jesuit, gives the following exposition of this parable.

Our *adversary* here intimated, says he, is that man whom we have offended; whom we have contumeliously called *Race*, and *fool*; for which he shall implead us at God's tribunal. *The way* is the time of this

this life ; *the judge*, Christ, who shall then tell us, what we have done to the least of his brethren, we have done to himself: *the officer* is the Devil, or some evil spirit, by whom God afflicts sinners ; the *prison* is hell, and *the last farthing* the least sins and offences ; and that this expression of *paying the last farthing* is proverbially used to signify one who is to be punished with the utmost rigour. And whereas our Saviour afterwards says, *he shall not go out thence till he has paid the last farthing*, his meaning, continues Maldonate, is not that he should go out afterwards ; but, as St. Augustine expresses it, that he shall not go out at all ; for this reason, because those in Hell, for every mortal sin, stand indebted for infinite punishment, which it is impossible they should ever be able to satisfy. Stella in his Comment on the 12 c. of St. Luke, explains our Saviour's words in a similar manner, and says that the words, *until he has paid*, mean that he shall never pay : the particle *Donec* in Scripture frequently signifying eternally. Agreeably to this exposition, Tolet (a Jesuit and the first Cardinal of their Order, and whom, on that account, we may place in the lists in competition with Bellarmine) tells us, That sense is most proper and applicable to the parable. " That man, says he, who dies  
M " without



“without remission obtained in this life,  
 “shall certainly be sent to the prison of  
 “Hell, until he satisfies his debt; not that  
 “he shall one day satisfy it, and so be re-  
 “leased, for that shall never be; but our  
 “Saviour uses this expression to shew that  
 “there is no other, and so, by conse-  
 “quence, no way at all of escaping.”

Thus it appears that not only Protestants,  
 in favour of what Papists call heresy, but  
 some plain-dealing Jesuits, in vindication  
 of the truth, have been so ingenuous as to  
 oppose Bellarmine himself in his pretended  
 proofs of a Purgatory. The offender in  
 this case is represented as dying in the guilt  
 of uncharitableness, which all who do, it  
 is confessed, must certainly perish, and there-  
 fore, the prison here signified must be a  
 place of eternal, and not of temporal pu-  
 nishment only: and were it necessary to  
 add to those authorities already adduced,  
 I might mention Jansenius (Concord. in  
 locum. cap. 20.) who gives the very same  
 exposition of this passage, from which, he  
 says, no one can justly urge a proof of Pur-  
 gatory. And this remark is evidently well  
 founded, since, upon the principles of our  
 adversaries, none are admitted there but  
 such as die in God's favour.

Another text, which Bellarmine and his  
 followers endeavour to wrest to their pur-  
 pose,

pose, is this, Matth. xii. 32. *Whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the Holy Ghoſt, it ſhall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.*

So heinous in the ſight of God, ſo highly offensive to the Divine Majeſty, is the ſin of blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, that our Saviour, in theſe words, plainly repreſents it as the only ſin which is utterly irremiſſible.

*It ſhall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come, or, in other words, it ſhall not be forgiven, or hath never forgivenesſs,* Luke 12. Mark 3. I ſay, in other words, becauſe theſe we find to be the words in which two other of the Evangelists have expreſſed our Saviour's meaning in this paſſage. Their deciſion, one might apprehend, ſhould preclude the neceſſity of any ſubſequent comment, as to the extent of Chriſt's meaning, in the latter part of this text. But not ſo, ſay the Romanists, for it is plain, from theſe words, that ſome ſins may be pardoned in another life, and therefore *the world to come* muſt mean Purgatory. But if the conſent of the Evangelists, as to the true ſignification of this paſſage, is not thought of ſufficient authority when placed in competition with that of their own writers, we have here the evidence of Bellarmine himſelf on our ſide,

side, who acknowledges that, according to the rules of logic, Purgatory cannot be inferred from hence. And if an argument which cannot stand the test of this criterion, be thought but a weak foundation for an article of faith, for a canon with the sanction of an anathema annexed to it, we shall find the proof little better supported by the authority of St. Austin, whose opinion is usually quoted with a view to confirm this notion. St. Austin, it is true, gives some intimations of a remission of sins in another life, but were he even more confident of what in fact he alledges with doubt and hesitation only, still this can have nothing to do with a Popish Purgatory; for there, *remission* is not sought for, but *satisfaction* is said to be given for sin: offenders are there and then punished with the greatest severity, after the guilt is remitted, and even because it is remitted: for, say the Romanists, if the guilt were not remitted, the sinner could not go to Purgatory, nor have the favour of being punished there. But on the contrary, so far is the doctrine of Purgatory from being capable of proof from the circumstance of remission of sins in another life, that it is an hypothesis which seems contrived in direct opposition to the idea of pardon hereafter: since those sins for which the

of  
an  
fai  
for  
Au  
im  
his  
con  
evi  
con  
Au  
of  
alre  
wri  
sup  
resp  
den  
T  
15.  
Thi  
one  
the  
cau  
adv  
its  
foun  
If  
emo  
rich  
Pur  
fal t  
of

offender has fully satisfied, cannot, with any shew of reason or common sense, be said to be forgiven. Those doubts therefore, which our adversaries tell us that St. Austin entertained, as to the possibility or impossibility of a Purgatory; whether, in his opinion, it was credible or incredible, concern us very little, while we have the evidence of Scripture and reason to the contrary: to which might be added St. Austin's own testimony, in different parts of his writings; but that has been done already. So that the decision of those very writers which the Romanists produce in support of their favourite doctrine, with respect to this text in St. Matthew, is evidently more against, than for them.

The next place alledged is, I. Cor. iii. 15. *himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* This text, Cardinal Bellarmine tells us, is one of the obscurest, but at the same time the most profitable; so manifest is their cause in the Scriptures that its highest advantages are the deepest obscurities, and its clearest light treasured up in the profoundest darkness.

If considered with a view to those worldly emoluments by which their Church is enriched, in consequence of that dread of Purgatory with which they have been careful to inspire their votaries, in that light  
any



any text or argument from Scripture may be truly said to be profitable to the interests of the Roman hierarchy, which can tend to seduce the dupes of their artifice into the belief of that doctrine.

But as obscure as these passages in St. Paul's writings may appear, when alledged in proof of the existence of a Purgatory, this text will, upon a very cursory view, be found altogether foreign to the question. Let us examine the context, v. 10th, &c.

*Let every man take heed how he builds thereupon; for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stone, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.*

Though no man, who pretends to be a preacher of the Gospel, can build upon any other foundation than that is laid, which is Jesus the Messiah, it is possible a man may build upon that true foundation *wood, hay, stubble*; things that will not bear the test, when the trial by fire at the last day shall

shall come. At that day every man's work shall be tried, and discovered of what fort it is. If what he hath taught be sound and good, and will stand the trial, as silver and gold and precious stones abide in the fire, he shall be rewarded for his labours in the gospel, but if he hath introduced false or unsound doctrines into the Christian Religion, he shall be like a man whose building being of wood, hay or stubble, is consumed by fire; he shall suffer the loss of all that is in store for the sincere propagators of the truth, as it is in Christ Jesus; though *he himself shall be saved*; but with the greatest difficulty, *so as by fire*. In the words of the Prophet Amos iv. 11. it is said, *I have overthrown some of you as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were as a firebrand pluckt out of the burning*. And again, Zech. 3. 2. Speaking of Jerusalem as rescued from imminent danger, *Is not this a brand pluckt out of the fire?* saith the Lord.

The same figure of metonymy is adopted by St. Jude 23. *Others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire*.

From these, and similar expressions in sacred, as well as profane writers, there can remain no shadow of doubt with any unbiassed reasoner, that the word *fire* in the close of this passage, in St. Paul's

Epistle to the Corinthians is part of a proverbial phrase, which denotes an escape from impending danger, even as a man escapes from a house that is on fire.

This interpretation is still further confirmed by the significant particle *as*. A circumstance, which duly considered, must effectually extinguish that elemental fire of Purgatory, which the Romanists have attempted to kindle by peremptorily refusing to understand the latter part of this passage in any other than a literal sense, whilst at the same time they acknowledge the word *fire*, by which men's works are to be revealed, and tried, as mentioned in the former part of the context, to be no other than a metaphorical expression, signifying that test or criterion by which every man's work shall be tried at the great day of recompense; that time of retribution which, without using these terms of analogy, the Apostle more plainly points out in the beginning of the very next chapter, *v. 5. Therefore, says he, judge nothing before the time until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts, and then shall every man have praise of God, i. e. that estimate set upon him by God himself which he truly deserves. But to evade the force of this argument which*  
must

must be evident to all whose understandings are open to conviction, our adversaries have made several attempts to wrest this text to their own purpose by an expedient, which, for want of others more plausible, they have too frequently adopted: I mean corrupting the Scriptures by unfair translations. With respect to the passage here in question, I shall mention two remarkable instances in which it has been grossly abused and perverted.

It is well known that in the Port Royal translation the words, *so as*, were designedly omitted, and the verse ended thus: *He shall be saved but, or though, going through fire.*—*Quoiqu'en passant par le feu.* Mels. de Port Royal.

*Mais en passant par le feu.* AMELOTTE. Nor was this passage of Scripture restored to it's primitive integrity till the seventh edition of their version was published, in 4to. in 1677. But the translators of Bourdeaux, less intimidated by such popular clamours\*, and more effectually to silence all gainsayers, surprized the Christian world with a new phænomenon, by adding the word Purgatory to this text, and accordingly translated it thus: *He himself shall be saved, yet so as by the fire of Purgatory.*—*comme*

\* See Le Clerc's Bibliotheq. Univ. tom. xi. p. 327.



*comme par le feu du purgatoire.* Notwithstanding those dreadful penalties under which God has forbid men to add to his word, or to take away from it, this is not the only place in Scripture which the translators of Bourdeaux have daringly corrupted for this purpose, by palpable interpolations. In St. Paul's first epistle to the Thessalonians iv. 14. it is said, *If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.* But in the version of Bourdeaux the words stand thus: *them also who sleep in Jesus the sleep of peace, will God bring with him.* The apostle, therefore, say they, by mentioning those that sleep the sleep of peace, must be supposed to intimate that there are some *who have a restless sleep*, who are racked and tortured by devouring flames, that prey upon their vitals without consuming them. Whether this consequence will hold, according to the principles of sound logic, is not necessary to enquire, since it is a sufficient objection to this interpretation that the premises on which it depends are false: for if we have recourse to the original, or which is the same thing, to any fair and faithful translation, it will appear that the Apostle makes no distinction among those *that sleep in Jesus*; nor does he say any more, even according to all other Romish

inter-

interpretations, than that *those who sleep in Jesus God will bring with him.*

It is said I. Pet. iii. 19. that Christ went to preach to the *spirits in prison.* That is, say the Romanists, to the souls in Purgatory. Some, it is true, have from hence concluded, that our Saviour in the interval betwixt his death and resurrection, preached to the separate souls in Hades, or the invisible regions. But to this it is answered, that those words can by no means justify this assertion, unless it can be proved that by the word spirit is meant the soul of Christ, whereas the spirit by which he is said to preach, was no other than that spirit of divinity by which he was quickened, as is evident from the connexion of the words; *he was quickened by that spirit by which he went and preached to the spirits in prison*: that is, by the eternal spirit of God, who is the author of the resurrection: and moreover, since the persons to whom he preached by the spirit were only such as were *disobedient in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing*; for the words evidently relate to the long-suffering of God to men living in those days; it were in vain to pretend to understand these words of the promulgation of the Gospel to the Jews or Gentiles then in Hades, still less can they be brought to prove that our

Saviour, after his death, preached to the souls in Purgatory. Another text, of no less singular obscurity (as if they loved darkness rather than light) is, by the sophistical inferences of the Romish Divines, selected in proof of this doctrine, which we find in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians xv. 29. *What shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?* Why then, say the Romanists are they all afflicted with so many severe penances, and forced to make many prayers for the dead? Baptism, we are told, sometimes signifies suffering affliction, and even death itself.

Such were the sufferings of Christ, whereby he was consecrated and prepared for his kingly office; according to that of St. Luke, xii. 50. *I have a baptism to be baptized with; that is a death to suffer.* But will it be said that prayer is so irksome a duty to the faithful, so sore a punishment, that Baptism must signify prayer likewise as an affliction? *Is any among you afflicted?* says St. James, let him pray — James iv. 13. that God may alleviate or sanctify his affliction.

Prayer, therefore, according to this Apostle's notion, is not itself an affliction, but the readiest means of obtaining relief from it. So that whatever being baptized  
for

for the dead, in this passage, may be supposed to imply, it cannot mean praying for the dead, either in, or out of Purgatory.

To throw what light we can upon this text, we are to observe, that St. Epiphanius mentions a custom of some Heretics in former days, who were baptized in the stead of those professed Christians who had accidentally died without baptism; and this Tertullian likewise supposes to have been practised. But as this observance is mentioned by the former of these writers as no other than heretical, and as the account of it is declared by him to have been derived to his times by no better authority than bare tradition, Tertullian, at the same time expressing his sentiments on this head, with apparent doubt and uncertainty, barely supposing such a thing might have been done by some, but not mentioning either time or persons; then these words of the Apostle seem capable of these two interpretations only; either that of the ancients; Chrysost. Theodoret, Photius, &c. namely, *Why are they baptized for the resurrection of the dead?* In expectation and belief of that fundamental article of the Christian Faith; or this, why are they baptized for that Jesus, who, according to their doctrine must still be dead? So uncertain is it whether any in  
the



the Apostles times were baptized for others, in the manner I have related, whilst no one can doubt that all who received Christian Baptism, were of consequence baptized in the name of Jesus.

As this last mentioned text is alledged with a view of justifying the practice of praying for the dead, that being the purport of the concluding part of this article of the Trent Creed, I shall add one more, of which Bellarmine and his adherents would willingly avail themselves, in proof that this practice is not without sufficient warrant from Scripture. It is recorded, say they, in the second book of Maccabees, C. 12. that Judas prayed for the Dead. To which we answer, that the book itself is not of sufficient authority to establish a matter of Faith. Our adversaries themselves confess thus much, nor need more be desired. Du Pin. Biblioth. dissert. prel. They allow that this book was never received by the Jews as canonical. Bellarm. de Purg. natalis Alex. That St. Jerom therefore rejected it out of the canon of the Christian Church; that it was not of a long time after received into it. Bell. ibid. And that Pope Gregory the Great, 600 years after Christ, did not receive it as canonical. Canus l. 2 c. 10.

but

But were we to allow this Book whatever credit is desired, yet still this text is by no means clear for the proof of that to which it is here applied; and for this reason, amongst others of equal weight, namely, that we have not in this passage, that precedent which they would alledge; because it is not true that Judas did pray for the dead. The story, as related in the 2d book of Maccabees, is this, c. 12 v. 39 &c.—*The day following, as the use had been, Judas and his company came to take up the bodies of them that were slain, and to bury them with their kinsmen in their fathers' graves. Now under the coats of every one that was slain, they found things consecrated to the idols of the Tannites, which is forbidden the Jews by the Law. Then every man saw that this was the cause wherefore they were slain. All men therefore praising the Lord, the righteous Judge, who had opened the things that were hid, betook themselves unto prayer, and besought him, that the sin committed might wholly be put out of remembrance. Besides that, noble Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forsomuch as they saw before their eyes the things that came to pass for the sins of those that were slain.*

*And when he had made a gathering throughout the company to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer*

*offer a sin-offering.* Which sin-offering was for himself, and the congregation as prescribed by the Levitical Law. Lev. 4. 13. for the original Greek does not here say that this sin-offering was intended as an atonement for the dead. Viz. *προσάγαγον* *περι αμαρτίας θύσαν.* Nor does it concern us that the word *dead* is in the vulgar Latin translation foisted in to serve a turn in the narrative of this history. I repeat in the narrative, because all that follows, to the end of the Chapter, is no other than the conjecture of the Historian who commends the design of Judas in praying for the dead without proving, or even asserting in the first relation of the fact, that his design was really such. Nor can it be said that the opinion of the Author of this book will justify this act of Judas, were it true that he did pray for the dead, any more than the act of one Razis, as recorded by the same Writer, in the next chapter but one of the same book, can be urged in defence of self-murder, since both these are applauded by the Author. So that were it true that Judas did pray and offer sacrifice for the dead, such prayers and sacrifices being nowhere prescribed or allowed in the law of Moses, or in any other part of the Holy Scripture, this act at best must have been a sinful piece of will-worship; in this case  
 still

still more flagrant, as the offenders had  
 perished in the grossest act of disobedience,  
 no less than idolatry; which our pontifi-  
 cians themselves declare to be a mortal sin,  
 and therefore to merit eternal Punishment,  
 and not the temporal pains of purgatory,  
 only. As therefore Judas would have  
 done evil in offering an atonement for  
 those who had died in the sin of idolatry,  
 we may justly infer from hence, not only  
 that the Author of this book is highly cul-  
 pable in calling evil good, and conse-  
 quently his writings cannot be received as  
 the dictates of inspiration, but that the  
 whole of this transaction is foreign to the  
 idea of a Popish Purgatory, where those  
 only are said to go who die in God's fa-  
 vour: nor, according to the Romanists, was  
 there, at that time, any such place as Pur-  
 gatory for them; since, if not consigned  
 to a place of eternal torment, these sinners  
 must, in their belief, have been confined in  
 another region, viz. *in limbo patrum*, where  
 they tell us the souls of the ancient fathers  
 were detain'd, till our Saviour descending,  
 set them free. In whatever light there-  
 fore this passage is considered, it is far  
 from satisfactory as to the point in ques-  
 tion. The book is not canonical; what  
 Judas did respected not the dead; if it did,  
 it was with reference to their future resur-  
 rection



rection, and not their present sufferings in a disembodied state: nor could their souls, as detained in Purgatory, be helped by the prayers of the living, since as yet there was no such place. On the whole, therefore, seeing that the doctrine of Purgatory, or prayers for the dead, is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, to the Jewish as well as the Christian dispensation, we ought to reject it with abhorrence; and the very silence of Scripture on this head is a virtual injunction so to do. As far as it may be in their power to *hurt the body*, let us guard against all plots, treasons, assassinations and massacres of our irreconcilable enemies of the Roman Church; but, as well assured that they cannot *hurt the soul*, we may despise the thunder of the Vatican, and slight their unchristian anathemas as a *curse causeless which shall not come*.

Though we have little room to hope that the clergy of that communion will be persuaded to renounce an hypothesis upon which their worldly interest so much depends; and though their laity should sturdily suffer themselves to be beguiled with false insinuations, it doubtless behoves them all to beware, lest, if *they delight in cursing, it should happen unto them*, and

*they love not Blessing, it should be far from them.*

Widely different from these, my Reformed Brethren, are our principles and our sentiments, and therefore, better things are to be hoped from us; and, as we are told, that in Heaven no unclean thing can enter, that without holiness no man can see the Lord, let us *cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord.*

Let us work our work betimes, while the day of salvation lasteth, *ere the night cometh, when no man can work*: resting finally assured that we are not to be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver or gold, but with the precious Blood of Christ, which cleanseth from all sin. Wherefore, my beloved, as we are bought with a price, let us glorify God in our body, and in our spirit, which are God's.

## LECTURE VIII.

MATTHEW IV. 10.

*It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy  
God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

**N**OTHING more evidently shews the exact conformity between Paganism and Popery, than the worship of the dead: so near is the resemblance, if not identity, even according to Popish Authors, between the adoration which the Pagans paid to their gods, and that service which the Papists avowedly offer to their saints, whether real, pretended, or imaginary; that, were it not that Modern Rome, in point of superstition infinitely surpasses the Old one, any unprejudiced enquirer might reasonably doubt which of the two deserve the name and honour of being the original

nal in this respect. The Pagans paid homage to whoremongers, incestuous forcerers, and magicians, that they might make them favourable to themselves in the practice of the like enormities. They built temples to them; they offered their prayers to them as mediatory spirits between the superior gods and them: they put themselves under their protection: they chose them for their patrons.

The Papists do all this to their saints, many of whom (as is evident from their own legends) have been unclean wretches, without shame, without virtue, without modesty, and void of all natural religion. Notwithstanding all this, they are prayed to; their names are put in the calendar, a festival is instituted for them, sacrifices are offered in their honor, men shelter themselves under their merits, recommend themselves to their intercession, ask of them every thing that they want; they are made the protectors of cities, of kingdoms, and of families: so that the contrast between the religious worship of Ancient and Modern Rome, will be found to amount to little more than a difference in the disposition or attitude of the figure, or, in other words, that Popery is no other than Paganism in a new dress. Both *becoming vain in their imaginations and having*



*having their foolish heart darkened, they both are guilty of the changing of the truth of God into a lye, or, as the Jansenists explain the passage, the transferring what was discoverable by the light of reason of the true God, to false divinities.*

The Romanists, therefore, directly not barely, by collateral consequence violate that first grand prohibition in all natural as well as revealed religion, pronounced by the Supreme Being himself, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me.*

To carry on the parallel; are the supereries of a Popish canonization less absurd or less impious, than were those of a Pagan apotheosis? How nearly (the ceremonial of an Heathen sacrifice excepted) does the superstitious worship of the demi-gods resemble the devotion now offered up to the supposed saint? Could the divine honours formerly paid to Hercules be more vain than those since bestowed on St. Anthony? or, to shorten the detail, was any female deity among the Gentiles, either Ashteroth, called the queen of Heaven, or Cybele, their famed mother of the gods, declared invested with more sacrilegious and profane authority, or adored under titles, and in addresses more blasphemous than that excellent person the Virgin Mother? who, thus described, is injuriously

as well as absurdly drawn out of character, while she, so remarkably distinguished below for the *ornament of an humble spirit*, is no longer allowed to retain the slightest symptom of her former humility, but on the contrary is represented above, as swollen with imperious arrogance, and affecting no less rivalry and competition with the Deity, than that which of old occasioned the expulsion of those fallen angels, who are still held under chains of darkness to the judgement of the great day. In a word, the superstition of the Pagans and Papists appears to be the off-spring of the same parent; a false notion, a servile dread of the divine attributes, widely differing from that religious fear of God, which, by the Wise Man is said to be the beginning of wisdom, an incontestable evidence of a good understanding.

It is unquestionably with no less impiety than ignorance, that men frame to themselves an idea of the Supreme Being, resembling that of a proud Eastern Tyrant, locked up, and sequestered from all access, and approachable only to some celestial favourites; that to these they are tempted to have immediate recourse, hoping through their influence, and powerful intercession, that their requests will be the most successfully preferred.

To

To banish such abject and unbecoming apprehensions of the Deity, from the minds of men, and more effectually to extirpate all kinds of idolatry, by instructing us more fully in the nature of the Godhead, was one great design of our Saviour in the Christian Institution. To this end, therefore, he manifestly confines all religious worship, and religious service, to God alone. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* In this his answer to the Tempter, he evidently excludes all creatures, from the worst and lowest, to those of the most exalted nature, from any share in religious worship. He refused to worship Satan, not merely because he was an angel of darkness, but because the prerogative of the Deity implies an exclusive right to all religious service and adoration. And further to prove the unity of mediatorship, as well as of the Godhead, one Apostle, asserts in the fullest terms, that *there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, namely, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.* And another as expressly tells us, that *there is an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world.* Here, and indeed throughout the whole Gospel, we find our Lord's mediatorship

torship essentially interwoven with his being our propitiatory sacrifice, and we cannot therefore confer upon any saint or angel, a share of the former, without making him intrude upon the latter. This great High Priest being God incarnate, has not only a sympathetic sensibility of our necessities, but is no less able than willing to assist us. Whilst *Abraham, the father of the faithful, and the friend of God* (and consequently the best of his sons) are ignorant of us, Christ, we are certain, hears our prayers *and understands our thoughts afar off*: and to him therefore, as our only intercessor *should all flesh come*. This may serve as an answer to the Romish divines, who pretend that, though Christ is our only mediator of *salvation*, yet there are many mediators of *intercession*; since it is in the right of a *redeemer*, of having purchased us with his blood, that he becomes our most powerful and *only intercessor*.

Thus the apostle St. Paul, having said *there is one mediator*, adds, *who gave himself a ransom for all*. So Rom. viii. 33. *It is Christ that died, yea rather who is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us*.

If a man sin, (says St. John, I.—II. 2, 3) *we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ*

N



*Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins.*

This may appear further, from the strict analogy which there is, and ought to be betwixt the Jewish and Christian worship.

St. Paul frequently in his epistles, especially that to the Hebrews, makes the legal priesthood typical of the evangelical. If then, under that dispensation, the priests were not to make intercession for the people, without a sacrifice first offered up to atone and propitiate for their sins; it follows that, under the Gospel, we can have no other mediator than one, who brings a sacrifice along with him, and that only has our Lord done, who is both our Priest and our Sacrifice: who hath offered up himself on the cross, a sacrifice for our sins, and now intercedes, in the merits of his own *Blood*, and the *propitiation* he hath made.

Thus the Apostle wholly excludes both angels and saints from being mediators of intercession, as in another place he as plainly condemns that doctrine, and forewarns Christians against it. I. Tim. iv. 1 *Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, Διδασκαλίας Δαιμονίων, the doctrine of demons, that is, of worshipping demons*

as mediators between God and man. An exact prophecy of what the church of Rome now teaches and practices, as to the worship of angels and saints departed, but what the Apostle calls no less than an apostasy, or *departing from the faith of Christ*.

But were it true that the Romanists had a right to frame this distinction, they still oppose their own doctrine, while they pray to the Virgin Mary, not only to intercede for her votaries, but even to save all those that glorify her. While they call her the mother of mercy, not only by virtue of her *intercession*, but by way of distribution and dispensation; and that Christ, having reserved the kingdom of justice to himself, hath granted the kingdom of mercy to his mother. See Bonaventure, Gerson, Biel, Antoninus, Bernardinus, Gorran, Holcoth, Rut. Benzoni, &c. &c. If their Doctrine be true, why do they teach, not only that the dominion of the blessed Virgin is equal to that of her Son? not only that all power in heaven and earth was given to her? not only that in the right of a mother she may command her son, but that she may command God himself? she being superior to the three persons in the Holy Trinity. Turfelin. Epist. ded. hist. Lauret. Why did Andrew of Avellino, himself one of their saints (canonized in the year 1712) and now

worshipped in his turn, why did he utter such blasphemous absurdities of the Virgin Mary, in his sermons, still to be seen in the Convent of St. Paul, at Naples, as are asserted in the following propositions— That God could not damn those who had any external devotion to the Virgin, that being an evident sign of predestination; that, amongst other singular instances of her authority above, she once carried a Sicilian nobleman to heaven, not only in spite of the Devil, to whom he had given himself; but against the will both of the Father and Son.

That a man might be saved without the love of God, if he applied himself to our Lady: that she is the joint Redeemer and Saviour of the world with Jesus Christ.

In like manner the Papists pray to other saints, not only to intercede for them with God, but that they themselves would confer on them the greatest blessings, and such as it is in the power of none but God to bestow. Such as our Saviour himself, when on earth, declared that it was not in him to give, but should be given to them for whom it was prepared of the Father.

Thus they entreat of *St. Peter*, by the power given unto him, to untie the bonds of their iniquity: And of the other Apostle, to absolve them from their sins, by their command

*mand.* While to their guardian angel they speak thus—*Take hold of sword and buckler, and rise up to help me ; say unto my soul, I am thy salvation.*

That the Romanists, therefore, implore no more of their saints than that they would pray for them, is an evident untruth, as plainly appears, not merely from unguarded expressions of some enraptured devotees of their communion ; not only from the hyperbolical rhapsodies of their enthusiasts, but from their approved forms of devotion, public, as well as private ; from their liturgies, missals, breviaries, manuals, and catechisms ; from the established articles of their creed itself, and from the decrees of their councils, which, whoever opposes, is declared by their church to be accursed. In the eighth article of the Trent Creed, which is the avowed criterion of modern popery, are these words : *I also believe that the saints, who reign with Christ, are to be worshipped and prayed to, and that they do pray for us, and that their relics are to be venerated.*

This doctrine the council itself delivers in these words. *It is good and profitable, humbly to invoke the saints, and fly unto their prayers and help ; and whosoever denies that saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in Heaven, ought to be invocated, or does assert, that to intreat them to pray for any single person, is*



*idle, or is repugnant to the word of God, or opposite to the honour of Jesus Christ, our only mediator; or that it is a foolish thing to pray unto them, either with vocal or mental prayer, doth impiously think.* His they command all pastors to teach to their faithful people, pronouncing an anathema on any person who shall teach or even think the contrary.

The Roman catechism informs us, that *the holy church of God doth teach us, piously and humbly to fly unto the Mother of God, and to intreat her, by her intercessions, to reconcile God to us sinners, and to obtain those good things for us, which are necessary both for the present life, and that which is eternal.* Agreeable to this doctrine, as I have already intimated, are many of their forms of devotion; and accordingly in the *Rosary* of the blessed Virgin, childishly so called, from every ejaculation, to her being compared to a sweet smelling rose, we find ten Ave Marias for one Pater-Noster; as if that prayer, which our Lord himself hath taught us, were not equally an offering of a sweet smelling savour.

If it be asked how, and at what period of Time, the church of Rome thus deplorably relapsed into the idolatry of their heathen ancestors, worshipping the creature more than the Creator; of this we find no traces, for above 300 years after Christ.

Christ. In those early times of Christianity, some pious and well meaning fathers of the church, took up an idea, that the spirits of holy men departed, were not, as yet, admitted to the beatific vision; that if they were, they might in some degree, receive benefit from the prayers of the faithful, upon earth; and therefore instead of praying *to* them, they prayed *for* the departed saints, not as suffering in Purgatory, since that absurd notion was of a far later date; nor did they conceive that perfection to subsist, in the person of any deceased saint, so as to stand in no need of the suffrages of the faithful, the blessed Virgin herself not excepted; that being the exclusive excellence of Christ himself.

This precedent, it is true, the reformed Churches decline to follow, as it is not grounded in Scripture.

But to proceed; the superstition of praying *to* saints, commenced with addressees to martyrs, at the places of their interment, near the close of the fourth century, from a persuasion that they were present, and hovered about their tombs, and heard their supplications; so that from hence it is plain, that the notion of their omniscience, or ubiquity, did not as yet prevail, but was reserved for times of grosser ignorance.

It is true, the fathers in those days, especially in their funeral orations, not aware of the pernicious tendency of that practice, began to call upon the saints by way of apostrophe, or address. See Nazian. Orat. 2. in Paſt. in Fine. But soon, not more than fifty years after this, when this branch of oratory began to grow into a superstitious use, St. Chryſoſtom in particular, ſet himſelf to oppoſe it. See Chryſ. Hom. 16 ex var. in Mat. Locis. Tom. 2. If to this it be objected, that St. Chryſoſtom's maſs (as it is called) implies the neceſſity of praying to ſaints, it may be answered, that this repugnancy to his own doctrine, upon record, in his homilies, is not the only argument by which this maſs may be proved to be no other than a forgery: for it is moreover observable that prayer is therein made for Pope Nicholas, and the Emperor Alexius, who both lived after St. Chryſoſtom's time, the one five hundred, the other eight hundred years.

The Invocation of Martyrs did however take place amongſt private Chriſtians, in the latter end of the fourth century.

The natural ſuperſtition of mankind exerted itſelf ſtrongly, and no ſmall indulgence was allowed to the prejudice of an heathen education, which at that time  
was

was the case with many; and, with a view to captivate the minds of the Greeks, and other Pagan devotees, it was unwarily proposed to them, to worship the saints and martyrs, instead of their gods. But the public offices of the Church were still uncontaminated; as appears both by the *constitutions*, and the testimony of several writers of those days. Even in the year 754, the invocation of saints was condemned by a council of 338 bishops, at Constantinople, as is acknowledged by the second Council of Nice, which first established this superstition, in the year 787. So that in subsequent ages, it became usual for the publick prayers of the Church of Rome to be directed immediately to the saints, in those supplications called litanies, and that with as intense humility of gesture and expression, as that with which the Deity was ever approached, and for the most invaluable blessings which the Supreme Being can impart; which amply justifies the charge of idolatry, cast upon the Romanists by all reformed churches.

*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

Thus the law of Moses expressly enjoins the worship of God, and of him only; and thus our Saviour, who declares that he



he came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law, confirms in his Gospel authority of this first and great commandment.

Notwithstanding this plain injunction, as the Church of Rome gives religious worship to creatures, the question remains how they evade the force of this law, since it is no where repealed, nor do they pretend that it is. For this purpose, they plead in the first place, that they worship God only as supreme—that they are careful to distinguish the honour paid by them to the Deity, from that inferior degree of veneration which they offer to angels, and departed saints, which distinction is pointed out by different appellations; namely *Latria*, and *Dulia*. But this will appear but a very inadequate apology for so gross a misapplication of their worship, when it is easily proved, not only that they direct their Orisons, in the highest strains of devotion, to those who are no gods, but further, that the very species and degree of veneration, which they pretend to confine to their saints, is equally forbidden by the divine law, to be offered to any but God. Of the first of these I have alledged sufficient proofs; to which may be added, the testimony of those Romish authors who have not scrupled to declare, that the images of the cross and of  
Christ

Christ, are to be adored with *Latria*, that is, the highest and most proper worship, or the same which is paid to God himself. Thomas Aquinas. Roman Pontifical.

For the latter, that all creature-worship, of what kind or degree soever, is forbidden, one pregnant testimony may suffice. *Howbeit* (says St. Paul to the Galatians) *then: when ye knew not God, ye did service (συνελευσάτε: unto them which by nature are not gods.* Gal. iv. 8.

This is imputed to them as an error and a sin; namely, paying that religious veneration which the Romanists call *Dulia*, for so it is in the original Greek, to those who by nature are not gods. That service, therefore, which the Apostle here distinguishes by the same term, must be rendered to him only who is *by nature God*.

Again, say they, we desire our fellow-saints here on earth to pray for us, and therefore we may pray to saints and angels in Heaven, to pray for us. But in this argument there is no consequence, since the case is not parallel. We are commanded to pray one for another, and this we may request of our brethren, in this state of our pilgrimage, but it by no means follows from hence, that we may address our very prayers to our fellow creatures, or seek pardon through their merits, as  
their

their books of devotion plainly shew, is the constant practice of the Romanists.

On the contrary, we are told, that no man may deliver his brother, nor make agreement unto God for him, for it cost more to redeem their souls; so that he must let that alone for ever. To this may be added, that our fellow creatures in this world, are in a capacity of being informed of our wants; whereas, should we say that departed saints are capable of knowing our necessities, from our secret, and often from our mental prayers, that were evidently to ascribe to them an incommunicable property and perfection of him, who alone *knoweth the hearts of the children of men.* 2 Chron. 6. 30. Accordingly, the Romanists themselves differ about this matter to this day, nor can they satisfy themselves, or each other by what means the glorified saints have notice of our addresses to them; or, what in this case is fully requisite, how they obtain such knowledge as is necessary to assure them of our sincerity in prayer.

Another expedient of which our adversaries would avail themselves, in order to reconcile this species of idolatry to their votaries, is this. It is pride and arrogance (say they) to make our addresses to God immediately: rather are we to apply to him

him through the intercession of his favourites, as to a king, by the mediation of his courtiers.

But it will be found that this pretence, or vain shew of humility, is no other than that voluntary humility, flatly condemned by the Apostle, as tending to forward the worship of angels; the result of pride in men, who, *vainly puffed up by their fleshly minds, intruding into those things which they had not seen, and not holding the head, even Christ.*

Upon this pretence, and by this same argument of affected humility, the Gentiles of old advised and defended their worship of dæmons. Theodr. in Coloss. 2. And an ancient father of the church plainly asserts, *that the heathen idolaters, to skreen the shame of their neglecting of God, were wont to avail themselves of this wretched plea, that by these they might go to God, as by officers men approach a king.* Ambros. in c. 1. ad Rom. But to shew the vanity of this pretence, this author proceeds; *For this reason do men go to the king by tribunes, or officers, because the king is but a man, and knoweth not to whom he may commit the state of the commonwealth.*

*But in our addresses to God, who knoweth the merits of all men, and from whom nothing*



*is hid, we need no spokesman, but a devout mind.*

Some, again, undertake to vindicate this practice of directing our prayers to saints, from the known success of such prayers. This, by a writer of the Roman communion, is called a convincing argument: *Cathol. no Idolat.* And he produces several instances in confirmation of it. But can the Papists think, that the fabulous account of their golden legends, and mirrors of saints, are an adequate foundation to ground this erroneous practice upon? The Scripture, which should be the rule of faith for all Christians, affords no testimonies of miracles being wrought in consequence of prayers to the dead; and were it even true that some of those preternatural events have taken place, which are recorded in their legends, would not this argument prove too much, if it could prove any thing?

Might it not be adduced in support of direct Pagan idolatry; since we have, in profane history, repeated instances of the heathens praying to Jupiter, to Bacchus, or to others, which by nature were no gods, and their prayers were in effect answered; not to say that it has been confidently affirmed by credible writers (Chrysost.) that the dæmons of the Gentiles wrought

wrought miracles for the confirmation of Paganism, and the Pagan idolatry.

*They oftentimes by their skill cured diseases, and restored the sick to health. Shall we then, on that account, partake with them in their impiety? God forbid.*

*When, again those wicked spirits, (says another well known writer (Euseb.) meaning those that were worshipped under the name of dæmons) saw mankind brought off to a deifying of the dead, they insinuated themselves, and helped forward these errors, by causing motions in those statues which were consecrated to the honour of the deceased, as also by oracles, and curing diseases; by means of which, the superstitious and credulous people took them to be some heavenly powers, and gods indeed: sometime to be the souls of their deified worthies. And thus, says he, the earth-neighbouring dæmons, those princes of the air, those spiritualities of wickedness, and ring-leaders of all evil, were accounted gods. They counterfeited the souls of the deceased by working many wonders.*

We know, then, of whom it is said, 2 Thess. 2. 9. *That his coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders. Great, indeed, has been that disparagement which has befallen the Christian Religion, in consequence of those feigned miracles which have been repeatedly*

edly obtruded upon the world, by the biographers of the Roman Church, and at the same time it seems altogether unaccountable that they themselves are not aware how much their own cause is weakened and exposed by such flagrant and absurd misrepresentations.

This plea, therefore, of justifying prayers to saints by their subsequent effects, it is to be apprehended, will prove but a ruinous entrenchment. Nor does the Scripture, any where command, advise, or countenance this mode of worship—we are there frequently directed to pray to God, but to no other.

*Call upon me in the time of trouble, &c.* When ye pray, saith our Saviour to his Disciples, say, *Our Father &c.*

Many of the learned, among the Romanists, freely grant that there is no express command in Scripture, for the invocation of saints. Bell. de SS. Beat. c. 19. Salm. Eck. Not in the *Old Testament*, because the souls of the patriarchs, and other holy men, were detained in Limbo, and were not admitted into Heaven, till our Saviour, after his resurrection, conveyed them thither. Not in the *New Testament*, lest it should be an occasion of offence and scandal to the new converted Gentiles, who might be apt to suspect, that they had only changed

changed their gods, and not their religion; and that the Christian doctrine was no other than a device, contrived by the Apostles, to thrust out the old dæmons and heroes, in order to introduce themselves as objects of adoration, in subsequent ages. This argument, it may be presumed, is still of equal force, and might serve as well to justify the abolishing this idolatrous practice, as it did of old, for a time, to prevent its taking place: and the Romanists would do well to consider, what offence it has long given to a great part of the Christian world.

Except in the abstruse Book of Revelation, Eckius, Salmeron, Barnes and others, confess that this usage hath no footsteps in the New Testament.

St. Paul, as I have already observed, expressly condemns worshipping angels through a voluntary humility, after the vain philosophy of the Platonists, who yet did not worship them as gods, any more than Papists do, but only as messengers, or mediators between God and men: and it doubtless behoves them to take notice, that this Apostle, elsewhere, asks the Church of Rome, *how shall they call on him in whom they HAVE NOT BELIEVED?*

The last clause of this article, enjoins the veneration or worship of the relicks of saints departed.

After



After the notorious frauds, palpable cheats, and ridiculous folly, by which the Romanists have endeavoured to maintain this preposterous devotion, have been so amply exposed by Erasmus, and others of their own communion, it seems strange that the Trent Council should attempt to establish this as an article of the Catholic faith.

What has been said in answer to the pleas of the Romanists, in favour of saint-worship, may in general suffice for this last-mentioned species of adoration : to which may be added, that if the worship of any creature be in itself indefensible, then that veneration which is at any time paid to relicks, or other inanimate things, as it is equally idolatrous, so is it, at the same time, a pregnant indication of a still more infatuated, a more darkened and deluded mind.

The Scripture proofs, which have been alledged in support of this absurd devotion, are too trifling, too foreign to the purpose, to deserve a serious refutation. *A dead man was raised to life by touching the bones of Elisha : from St. Paul's body were brought handkerchiefs and aprons unto the sick, and diseases were healed, and evil spirits cast out :* that is, because God and his servants, by his power, worked *miracles*, therefore it

is as clear as the sun, that the relicks, or the supposed remains of every deceased Roman Catholic, whom, for valuable considerations, the Pope has ordered to be placed in the calendar of saints, are to be adored.

Whereas we do not find that the bones of Elifha, were worshipped; and the handkerchiefs and aprons were no relicks of St. Paul, who was then a living, not a dead Saint, nor does it appear that any adoration was paid to them.

Since then, it was one great design of Christ's appearance in the world, to extirpate all the remains of idolatrous worship, is it to be supposed, that the worship of saints, and of their relicks, as it is practised in the Church of Rome, can be any part of Christian worship, or allowed by the Gospel of Our Saviour? If creature worship were so offensive to God, here is still the worship of creatures and images, and therefore all the visible idolatry, that was ever practised in the world before. All that our adversaries can pretend is, that they have more just notions of the worship of saints than the Heathens had; but this will be difficult to prove. The Pagan philosophers offered the same apology for their worship of dæmons, which the learned among the Romanists now alledge in justification of their worship of saints

saints, and whether unlearned Papists may not be led to entertain as gross notions relative to their worship of saints, as the illiterate among the Heathen, has been much suspected amongst the learned, even of their own communion. Were there, indeed, any difference on this account, can we think that Christ, who came to abolish all idol-worship, intended to set up a new kind of creature-worship, in greater pomp than ever, and only to rectify men's opinions about it? Under the law, we find, that to prevent this, God did not go about to rectify men's opinions only, of these things, but absolutely forbid the worship of any other being but himself, which, we are to conclude he would not have done, had there been such great advantages in the worship of saints, angels, or images, as the Romanists pretend. Nor again are we to suppose, that Christ, who came to make a more perfect reformation, should only change their country gods into saints and angels; and give new names to their statues and images; which, whatever he might teach about it, instead of extirpating idolatry, had been to set up that same kind of worship which the law of Moses absolutely forbid, and condemned as idolatry.

On

On the contrary, by the Incarnation of his own Son, God has not only taken care to rectify men's mistakes, in respect to the immediate worship of the Deity, but has at the same time, effectually cut off all pretences for misconception in this matter, since after the appointment and manifestation of a sufficient and powerful mediator, even the Son of God, incarnate, men can no longer plead that vast distance between God and sinners, which may justify their approaches to the throne of grace, through any other intercession, than of him who alone is the real adequate propitiation for our sins, and through whose merits, the truly penitent may rest assured of pardon and acceptance, even Jesus Christ the righteous, our only mediator and advocate.

Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly, above all we ask or think, unto him be glory in the Church, throughout all ages, world without end, Amen.



# LECTURE XI.

EXOD. XX. 5.

*Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor  
serve them.*

**T**HE religion of a Christian consists in faith and hope, repentance and charity, divine worship, and due celebration of the Sacraments; and finally in keeping the commandments of God. But in all these, both in doctrines and practices, the Church of Rome does most dangerously err, and teach men so to do.

They do injury to faith, by devising new articles, and enjoining them as necessary to salvation. They render hope vain and fruitless, by placing it upon creatures, and things of mere human invention. They greatly sin against charity, by denouncing

nouncing eternal perdition against all who are not of their opinion. They invalidate the salutary doctrine of repentance, by making it to be consistent with a wicked life; with little, or no amendment. They worship they know not what; they pray to them that hear them not, and trust in that which cannot help them. As for the divine commandments, they leave one of them out of their catechisms and manuals, and whilst they earnestly contend for the possibility of keeping all the commandments, they do not insist upon the necessity of keeping any of them, in the course of their lives, till the evident approach of death. Concerning the Sacraments, they have notoriously prevaricated in two points. For, not to mention the unscholastical error of increasing their number from two to seven; they sacrilegiously deprive the people of one half of the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, in open defiance of that plain injunction of our Saviour, when he instituted that Sacrament, *drink ye all of this.*

They contrive little sacraments of their own, they invent superstitious rites, and pretend to annex spiritual graces to the observance of them, without a divine warrant or institution; and at length persuade their

their votaries to what can never be excused, material idolatry.

If these things are compatible with the duty of Christians, not only to eat what they worship, but to adore those things with divine worship which are not God; to reconcile a wicked life with assured hopes and expectations of Heaven at last, and to place these hopes upon other things than God, and to condemn all the world who are not Christians after their own rule and standard; if these things are so, then have we lost the true measure of Christianity, and the doctrine and discipline of the Gospel dispensation is not a natural or a rational religion; not a religion to make men holy, just, or good; but a confederacy under the conduct of a sect; and it must rest in forms and ceremonies, and devices of human invention.

But if, on the contrary, these appear to be no other than the corruptions of an erroneous sect, innovations of designing men, devised for purposes of worldly emolument, and contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, the only infallible rule of our faith, and standard of our practice, we cannot be too much upon our guard against the cunning craftiness of those who daily lie in wait to deceive; nor can we be too earnest in exhorting one another, lest by adopting the tenets of those whom the Apostle describes

as

as having departed from the faith, we suffer ourselves to fall under the like condemnation. With regard then to the subject before us,

So long as the people of modern Rome are seen, at this day, worshipping in the same temples, at the same altars, sometimes the self-same images, and with the same ceremonies as the ancient Romans, those must have an uncommon skill in distinguishing, as well as charity even more than Christian, who can acquit them of the heinous guilt of being partakers in the superstition and idolatry of their Pagan ancestors.

How diametrically opposite to such practice is the express Law of God, and the current of Scripture! Can any thing be more plainly, fully, and explicitly prohibited, by any law or statute, than every degree or species of image-worship is, by the second commandment? Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them. Thou shalt not bow down to them with thy body, nor serve them with the worship of thy soul. No words could possibly be chosen more comprehensive, and emphatic; nor could  
 O any



any law be more positive and clear, more pointed and particular : we are not only forbidden to worship any representation of that which has no existence in Nature, but to make for that end any graven image, or the likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above (as of the ever blessed Trinity, the sun, moon, stars, angels, or saints departed) or in the earth beneath (*the likeness of male or female, or of any beast that is on the earth, of any winged fowl that flieth in the air, of any thing that creepeth on the ground*) or in the waters under the earth, (*the likeness of any fish or aquatile*) Deut. iv. 16—20.

We are not only prohibited the worshipping of graven images, but any *similitude, representation, figure, or likeness of any thing in Nature*, infinite or finite, rational or irrational, animate or inanimate; whether it be the work of the statuary, smith, limner or painter. We are expressly commanded *not to bow down ourselves, or shew any religious reverence to them, nor before them.* 2 Chron. 25. 14. For these two phrases are of similar import, whatever the Roman casuists may alledge to the contrary. See Matth. iv. 9. Ἐκπροσκυνήσης μοι Luke iv. 7 Προσκυνήσης ἐνώπιόν μου.

Nor are we to serve them with our souls or bodies, in any religious act whatsoever.

So

So very explicit is this command, that it is plain, the blessed God would hereby discover the heinousness of the sin of image-worship, and how odious and provoking it is in his sight : and, at the same time leave men, whom in this their corrupted state he knew to be exceedingly prone to this worship, without the least pretence or shadow of excuse, should they dare to commit it, when he has thus cut off from them all possible evasion, or extenuation of their guilt.

How awful are the reasons annexed ! *I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, &c.* therefore thou shalt not worship them externally, or internally.

But both of these are the constant practice of the Romanists; and by the doctrine, and rules of their Church, they are obliged to both. The chief part of their devotion consists in the worship of images; which appears so grossly unwarrantable, that, to obviate the scandal of it, many of the more wary advocates for Popery, when amongst Protestants, will seem to deny that they pay any religious worship to images; or, at least cloud the matter with such distinctions as render it difficult, if not impossible to understand what it is they mean, or would maintain. But let

us proceed to enquire, how far their arguments in support of this practice will stand the test of examination.

Nothing is so much opposed in Scripture as the practice of image-worship. The main design of both the Old and New Testament seems plainly to be the utter extirpation of idolatry out of the world. Even before the writing of the Holy Scripture, the Jews had a tradition, that the prohibiting of idolatry was one and the chief of those *six precepts*, as they are called, of Noah; but when the law itself was given, and the Scripture of the Old Testament was penned, we find them continually forbidding image-worship, threatening and enjoining such severe penalties on those who practised it, that the Jews were at length effectually cured of their thirst after idolatry, so frequent from the beginning of their government under their and Kings.

Well then may it afford cause of just astonishment to the greatest part of the Christian world, that the Romanists have not only revived that abominable practice, which, among other works of the Devil, our Saviour came purposely to abolish: but what betrays the most daring confidence in their error is their undertaking to justify the worship of images, from  
those

those very Scriptures which as plainly and severely condemn every kind of creature-worship, as they do theft, adultery, or murder.

The number of those passages in Holy Writ, which the Papists alledge in favour of their manifest departure from the worship of the true God, it may well be expected, is but small, as their own reasonings from them are weak, and their deductions altogether inconclusive.

In one of their pretended general Councils, a great shew is made of proving this doctrine from Scripture. The whole of which amounts to this ;

God commanded Moses to make two cherubim at the two ends of the mercy seat. *Exod. 25. 18.* And again they remind us, that Moses heard a voice from between the cherubim, when he went to consult the Lord. *Numb. vii. 89.* But this is as far from proving that Moses worshipped those cherubim, as that the Papists themselves hear the voice of the Lord, whenever they bow before an image of St. Christopher, St. George, or of any saint who never existed. For want of a text to prove this, we have the bare affirmation of Bellarmine, who says, that the Cherubim were necessarily adored by those who adored the Ark.

But



But the Israelites did not worship the ark, still less the cherubim, which represented only the attendants on that representative throne. This mercy seat, together with the cherubim, it is well known, was placed in the Holy of Holies, where the priest only entered, and therefore the people were excluded from every approach to those images, which, it is evident were no more intended by the Almighty as objects of adoration, than the brazen serpent; which, as soon as it was thus abused, Hezekiah broke in pieces, and call'd it in contempt, Nehushtan; *i. e.* a piece of brass. ii. Kings. 18. 4. Again, we are informed by this same Council, that Ezekiel had a vision of a temple adorned with cherubim and palm-trees. If any real consequence can be drawn from this imaginary temple, it is, that churches may be adorned; but not that their ornaments are to be worshipped. Nor do we find, that in defiance of one of the great commandments in the law, Ezekiel is represented as kneeling, or bowing to those cherubim or palm-trees. At the same time, they give us St. Paul's description of the old tabernacle, Heb. ix. reasoning with equal validity from thence, that, as the Old-Testament directs cherubim to be placed over the mercy seat, so, under the New there

there must be images of Christ over the altar.

To this we might as readily answer, that as in the Old Testament, those cherubim were not adored, so neither under the New, are the images of Christ to be adored. But in reality, no consequence can be drawn from what appears to have been in the old tabernacle, to what must be in Christian churches; for then, by parity of reason, must we once more adopt bloody sacrifices, and many other manifestly abrogated rites of the ceremonial law: accordingly St. Paul, in this very passage, affirms, ver. 9. *Those were figures for the time present.* Ver. 10. *Imposed on them until the time of reformation.* His argument supposes an essential difference between their carnal and our spiritual worship, and therefore this proof likewise, is foreign to the purpose.

It is urged by the generality of writers in the Church of Rome, that *some creatures are to be religiously honoured for their bare relation to God.*

This they undertake to prove from a passage in the 99th Psalm. *O magnify the Lord our God, and fall down before his footstool, for he is holy.*

The footstool here mentioned, they inform us, is no other than the ark of God,  
which

which the Prophet commands us to worship: and as, when pressed with any difficulty in the interpretation of Scripture, they are always more ready to alter the very word of God, than their own opinion, which like the law of the Medes and Persians, is not to be altered, in their Latin version of the Bible this passage is made to end thus; *et adorete scabellum pedum ejus; and worship his foot-stool*. An abuse of Scripture, for which the translator stands self-condemned, by having adhered more faithfully to the original Hebrew, in his interpretation of the very same phrase, but four verses further in this psalm, v. 9. *et adorete in sancto monte ejus; and worship him in his holy mount*. From which last cited passage we may learn, that there is by no means a necessity to suppose that the ark of God is even alluded to; still less is the adoration of it enjoined: but, as our Saviour tells us, Matt. v. 35. *That the earth is God's foot-stool*, it is more than probable, that some peculiar part of the globe is here pointed out; even Mount Sion, which he loved, the holy hill on which the temple stood.

But, if it be true, that some creatures are entitled to a degree of honour, from their relation to God; that some things are called sacred or holy, on account of their

their relation to holy things; as the House of God; the utensils of it; the priest's garments; the Passover, or other ceremonials of the Jewish Law, which were unquestionably of divine institution; still what have these to do with the worship of images? Can it be proved that images stand in the same relation to God? or does it follow that things said to be sacred, as set apart from prophane use, are on that account to be religiously worshipped? But, to shew further to what wretched expedients our adversaries are reduced, in their misapplication of Scripture for the purpose in question, I shall offer one passage more, which was produced by a Bishop (*Theodosius*) in the council I have already mentioned, in proof of the lawfulness of image-worship. St. Paul tells us, Rom. 15. 4. *Whatsoever things were written aforetimes were written for our learning.* Accordingly, this learned and sage Prelate observes, *that holy and venerable images and pictures, as well as material writing, are for our learning.*

To this we answer, that the works even of prophane authors may likewise be said to be written for our learning; and it is as true, that pictures, or ancient inscriptions, though heathen, have their use in elucidating past occurrences in history. But  
this



this Bishop cannot prove, that St. Paul bids us adore these writings, since he plainly alludes to examples in the Old Testament which God left in writing; not in painting or carved work: and that, even for the benefit of those who cannot read themselves; since to them *faith cometh by hearing*.

This may serve at the same time, as a sufficient answer to the decision of Pope Gregory, who would encourage his votaries in the practice of idolatry, by declaring that "Images are the books of the unlearned." "Here they defend themselves (says a noted Writer of the Roman Communion) in the words of Pope Gregory, "Who says, that images are the books  
 " of the common people: that in them  
 " they may read who have not learnt to  
 " read, and, by seeing them, be drawn to  
 " the contemplation of God. But these,  
 " continues he are the words of Gregory, excusing human inventions: not  
 " so the commandments of God, which  
 " forbid them; nor does it become us  
 " to learn, by the forbidden book of  
 " images, but by the book of God;  
 " which is the Scripture. He, therefore,  
 " that is desirous to know God, let him  
 " not seek that knowledge from the images of painters and statuaries, but, as  
 Christ

“ Christ himself directs, let him search the  
 “ Scriptures, which bear witness of him ;  
 “ and they that cannot read, let them  
 “ hear the word of Scripture ; for the  
 “ faith of such, as St. Paul saith, is by  
 “ hearing ; and Christ says, My sheep,  
 “ hear my voice ; and if, as Christ says,  
 “ none can come to him, unless the Father  
 “ draw him, and none cometh to the Fa-  
 “ ther but by Christ, why do we take the  
 “ glory from God, and give it to pictures,  
 “ and statues, as though they could draw  
 “ us to the contemplation of God ?”

*Agrippa de vanit. Scient. p. 57.*

Such is the declaration of one of their  
 noted Writers, and indeed it is sufficiently  
 notorious that they do not wish to have this  
 doctrine tried by the test of Holy Writ ; for  
 we find that in this Council (Act. 1.  
 p. 58. A.) They obliged *Basilus*, when  
 he made his recantation, to anathematize  
 those who say “ They will not receive any  
 “ doctrine upon the bare authority of  
 “ Fathers and Councils, unless it be  
 “ plainly taught in the *Old and New Testa-*  
 “ *ment.*” A tacit acknowledgement that  
 Scripture is against them ; which Scripture  
 they accordingly proceed to vilify, by  
 exclaiming “ That all the patrons of he-  
 “ resy take occasion for their errors from  
 “ the divinely inspired Writings.” Act. 6.

p. 463.

p. 463. But from this general remark may well be excepted the patrons of image-worship, since they cannot find one text of Scripture to graft their error upon; and therefore they fly

To universal tradition for the veneration of images, which came (they say) from the preaching of the Apostles, and had been received for near eight hundred years, being the doctrine of all the preceding Councils, and Fathers, and yet but one Council of the six preceding take any notice of this matter; and all that is allowed in that one is the painting our Saviour in a human form, for a bare memorial, whereas he had before that time been represented as a lamb; but not a word of adoration.

Besides this, the very zealots for idolatry cite not one word out of any of those Councils, for their purpose; and Pope Gregory himself, who recommends the use of images to the unlearned, confesses that "there is nothing in those Councils" which relates more to that subject than "to eating bread, and drinking water." *Ep. Gregor. p. 27. D.*

The truth is, not one Council or Father mentions images till above 300 years after Christ; and for 300 more, they were only used for ornament, and historical use; where the adoration of them is vainly attempted

tempted to be proved by false and fabulous legends, spurious authorities, and by writers who lived but a very short time before this Council. It is true that about the year 600 the superstitious respect for images was considerably increased, even to a degree of adoration of them, in some places: but in consequence of this we learn, that some truly pious Prelates, animated by a holy zeal, broke the images, and cast them out of the churches; whose zeal Pope Gregory the first could not disapprove, though he wished that the images might still have remained, for the use of the unlearned. *Greg. Epist. ad Seren.* Whereas the common people, it is well known, proceeded so far towards idolatry, that the Jews, and even the Saracens, were highly scandalized at it: insomuch that it has been evidently proved, that the obstinate perseverance of the Romanists, in the practice of creature-worship, has been the grand obstacle of the conversion of the Jews to Christianity.

This we find signally exemplified in the following narrative of the proceedings of a great council of Jews, assembled in the plain of Ageda, in Hungary, about 30 leagues from Buda, to examine the Scriptures concerning Christ, on the 12th of October, 1650; by Samuel Brett, there present.



present. First printed in 1655. These are his words. "The assembly was by permission of the Turk, and King of Hungary, though they had been at war. On the seventh and last day of their consultation, the main query amongst them was, if Christ be come, what rules and orders has he left to his Church? and not being willing to be guided by the New Testament, they demanded some other instructions in this point.

"Thereupon six of the Roman Clergy, sent on purpose by the Pope, were called in: viz. two Jesuits, two Friars of the order of St. Augustin, and two of the order of St. Francis. These being admitted into the Council, began to open unto them the rules and doctrine of the holy Church of Rome (as they call it) which they declared to be the Holy Catholic Church of Christ; their doctrine to be the infallible doctrine of Christ, and their rules, those which the Apostles left to the Church, to be for ever observed; and that the Pope is the holy Vicar of Christ, and the Successor of St. Peter: and, for instance, in some particulars, they affirmed the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament; the religious observance of their holy days; the invocation of saints, praying to the Virgin Mary, and her commanding power in  
 "Heaven

" Heaven over her Son ; the holy use of  
 " the cross and images ; with the rest of  
 " their idolatrous and superstitious wor-  
 " ship ; all which they commended to the  
 " assembly of the Jews, for the doctrine  
 " and rules of the Apostles. But so soon  
 " as the assembly had heard these things  
 " from them, they were exceedingly trou-  
 " bled thereat, and fell into high cla-  
 " mours against them and their religion ;  
 " crying out, *No Christ ! no Woman-God !*  
 " *no intercession of saints ! no worshipping*  
 " *of images ! no praying to the Virgin*  
 " *Mary ! &c.*

" Truly their trouble hereat was so  
 " great that it troubled me to see their  
 " impatience. They rent their clothes,  
 " and cast dust upon their heads, and cried  
 " out, *Blasphemy ! Blasphemy !* and upon  
 " this the Council broke up.

" I do believe there were many Jews  
 " there that would have been persuaded to  
 " own the Lord Jesus : and this I assure  
 " you for a truth, and it is for the honour  
 " of our Religion, and the encouragement  
 " of our Divines : one eminent Rabbi  
 " there did deliver me his opinion, in con-  
 " ference with me, that he at first feared  
 " that those which were sent from Rome  
 " would cause an unhappy period to their  
 " Council ; and professed to me that he  
 " much

“ much desired the presence of some Pro-  
 “ testant Divines, especially English, of  
 “ whom he had a better opinion than of  
 “ any other Divines in the world. As for  
 “ the Church of Rome, they account it  
 “ an idolatrous church, and therefore,  
 “ will not own their religion: and by  
 “ conversing with the Jews, I found that  
 “ they generally think that there is no  
 “ other Christian religion in the world,  
 “ but that of the Church of Rome; and  
 “ for Rome’s idolatry, they take offence  
 “ at all Christian religion; by which it  
 “ appeareth, that Rome is the great ene-  
 “ my of the Jews’ conversion.”

But, to proceed in the annals of image-  
 worship, we find that a succeeding Emperor  
 (*Leo Isaurus*) by the advice of the bishops in  
 his time, rather chose to remove all ima-  
 ges and pictures out of the churches, than  
 give occasion to superstition and idolatry:  
 and his son and successor, Constantine the  
 sixth, after quelling the rebels of the  
 Pope’s faction, call’d a Council at Con-  
 stantinople, at which were present 338  
 bishops, in the year 754, who, by Scrip-  
 ture, reason, and antiquity, proved that  
 images and pictures were not to be adored;  
 and excommunicated such as worshipped  
 them; allowing the defacing of them to  
 prevent idolatry. But soon after this, we  
 are

are told in what manner, and by what means the worship of images was revived.

The empire descending on a minor of ten years old, his mother, *Irene*, usurped the empire, and after a long dissimulation in the preceding reign, began immediately to display her zeal for idolatry. She was a heathen by birth; daughter to a king of Tartary; a woman scarcely to be paralleled for ambition, dissimulation, and cruelty; who at last deprived this her son of his sight, his empire, and his life.

She deposed Paul, the Patriarch of Constantinople, as unfit for her purposes, and advanced a layman in his room. After this, she vainly attempted to assemble a council at Constantinople, to regulate the business of image-worship; for they were obliged to disperse, as soon as they were assembled. But about a year after, they found means to form a junto at *Nice* in *Bitbynia*, where they thought proper to establish image-worship in the year 787. This, together with the ratification of the decree, by the Trent assembly, in the middle of the 16th century, which was composed in like manner of the partizans of the Pope, if either of these can claim the appellation of a general, Œcumenical council of the Christian church, This, I say,



say, is all the authority which the Romanists can pretend to urge, in support of this their practice, from the approbation of Councils. We are at the same time to observe, that this pretended Council of Nice in Bithynia, was afterwards by a Council of 300 bishops, held at Frankfort, in the year 794, expressly condemned as null and void. In short, no other instance can be adduced of the practice of image-worship being proposed in a council of the Christian Church, where it was not expressly prohibited. *E. G. Concil. Elliber. Can. 36.* If we examine the testimony of the Fathers, we find them unanimous in opposing this practice. Origen plainly tells his adversaries, *That the images which were to be dedicated to God, were not to be carved by the hands of artists, but to be formed and fashioned in us by the Word of God, viz. The virtues of justice and temperance, of wisdom and piety, &c. that conform us to the image of his only Son.* Orig. cont. Cels. L. 4.

Lactantius traverses the arguments of the heathens, in defence of their image-worship, which arguments were the same that the Romanists have now adopted; and expresses himself thus emphatically: *Where there is any image, says he, there can be no religion.* Lactan. Instit. L. 2. c. 19.

It

It was not Catholic Christians, but the *Carpocratian Heretics* who made, and privately worshipped the images of Christ and St. Paul. *Iren. adv. Hær. L. 1. c. 2.* and though Eusebius speaks of some new converts who had made images of Christ, St. Peter, and St. Paul, he adds that this was *after the Pagan fashion. L. 7. c. 8.* Epiphanius Bishop of Salamine, tore a picture of Christ, which he found in a church in Palestine: and in the time of Optatus, we find that the Christians were greatly troubled, upon only a false report that an image was to be placed upon the Altar. *Optat. L. 3. ad Fin.*

“Let it be no part of our religion, saith St. Austin,” “to worship the works of men’s hands; for the artificers themselves are to be preferred before them; and yet even these we ought by no means to worship.” *August. de ver. Relig. Cap. 55.* “God forbids, saith Tertullian, the making of any kind of similitude; how much more then, a resemblance of God himself? The Author of truth loves not falsehood.” *Tertul. de spect. c. 23.* An awful intimation to those who presume to make, or rather to feign an image of God himself, or the ever blessed Trinity.

It is indeed a heavy, but just charge upon the Church of Rome, that they  
bring

bring the most sacred mysteries of religion into contempt, by their devices : That they paint the holy Trinity in such forms and symbolical figures, as they do not pretend that the Blessed Trinity ever appeared in. As in a face with three noses and four eyes ; one body with three heads, and, as an old man with a great beard, and a Pope's crown on his head, and holding the two ends of the tranverse rafter of the cross, with Christ leaning on his breast, and the Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove, hovering over his head.

Whoever has visited those countries where Popery prevails can be no stranger to this.

Thus they worship the images which, they say, are of God the Father, and the Holy Trinity, *figures* (as of the god Remphan) *which themselves have made* ; and *idols* by their own definition of an idol : viz. *simulacrum rei non existentis*. To return to Lactantius—he saith Instit. Lib. 1 “ We cannot worship God, if we give the same honour to any thing else.”

But the Papists, whatever some of their communion may pretend, both acknowledge, and strenuously defend, that they give to the images of God and Christ, and even to the cross of Christ, *Latria*, that is, the very same divine honour, which they

they yield to God and to Christ. Tho. Aquinas. par. 3. qu. 25.

Thus they say to the cross, after *Come, let us adore it*——“Hail, holy cross! our  
“only hope in this time of passion, in-  
“crease grace in the godly, and blot out  
“the sins of the guilty.” Breviar. Rom. ante Dom. Pass.

Thus they impiously ascribe to a piece of silver or gold, of wood, or of stone, an equal power and efficacy, as to the Blood and merit of Christ, or even as to Christ himself. *Zacharias Boverius*, the Spanish Friar, in his consultation directed to King Charles the First, when Prince, *Part 2. Reg. 1. p. 189. Edit. Mad. 1623.* says expressly “that the images of Christ,  
“and of the saints, ought with pious reli-  
“gion to be worshipped by Christians.” And Azorius the Jesuit, in his *Moral Institutions*, Tom. 1. lib. 9. c. 6. avers, that  
“it is the constant judgment of Divines,  
“that the image is to be honoured and  
“worshipped with *the same honour and*  
“*worship* wherewith that is to be wor-  
“shipped whereof it is an image.” And Friar Pedro de Cabrera, on a passage of Tho. Aquinas which I have already cited, makes these conclusions: 1. *That it is simply and absolutely to be believed that images are to be worshipped in churches, and that the*  
*contrary*



contrary is an heretical doctrine. 2. That images are truly and properly to be ADORED, and with an intention to them, and not only to the prototypes or originals that are represented in or by them. This he affirms to be the doctrine, not only of the said Thomas and his disciples, but of the schoolmen in general; and he there collects of these no less than nineteen in number for vouchers in this point: viz. *Cajetan, Capreolus, Paludamus, Ferrariensis, Antoninus Soto, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventure, Richardus de Media, Villa, Dionysius, Carthuganus, Major, Marsilius, Thomas Waldensis, Turrecremata, Augustus, Clichtoveus, Turrian, and Vasques*; doubtless a respectable party; all eminent, approved doctors of the Roman Church. To this if we add the decision of Cardinal Bellarmine, who avers, c. 21. "That images properly and of themselves are to be worshiped so as to terminate our veneration in them," we shall then no longer be strangers to the fallacy of those pretences by which the teachers of the Roman Communion mislead the dupes of their erroneous doctrine: such as their praying to images, not as such, but merely with respect to the prototype; that they adore them no otherwise than with relative worship; that the honour which is paid

to

to them, is only *Dulia*, an inferior species of veneration ; and not *Latria*, such as they confine to the worship of God himself. These, and similar pleas, must appear absolute falsities, according to their own doctrine, unless they will allow that their Church, notwithstanding her boasted unity, is so divided in opinion, that none can tell what she holds or asserts.

When, again, they endeavour to excuse themselves, by alledging that they worship not false gods, as the Heathens did ; but the true God, though an image ; besides that, it is as absurd, as it is evidently impious, to attempt the forming any representation of the Godhead ; such reasoners may not be aware, that this, amongst some other of their pleas, will tend to justify the idolatry of the Heathen, at least as much as their own ; since it is known that many of those believed in the unity, as well as the existence of the Supreme Being. So that the Romanists have only changed images with the Heathens, or sometime, indeed, have adored the same statues, and in the same temples, under different names, (witness the Pantheon at Rome) while they worship God, the very same way that the Heathens did ; even by corporeal representations, which the ancient Fathers declared to be idolatry, and which

which God himself repeatedly forbids, and in the most awful manner. *Take ye, therefore, good heed unto yourselves (for ye saw no manner of similitude, on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire) lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, &c. &c. Deut. iv. 15, 16. To whom will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him? saith the Lord, by the mouth of his holy Prophet. Is. xl. 18. 25. xli. 5.*

As for the words, *image* and *idol*, on which the Jesuits found their distinction, if we respect the original and ancient use of them, they are all one. To avoid endless citations from prophane writers, we have ample proof of this from the Septuagint translation, where the original word is construed sometimes by an *idol*; sometimes by a graven image, and sometimes by an *image*, or *likeness*. That the idols of the Heathens, were figures of things which never existed, is a false assertion. They had images of men without number: besides symbolical figures, they had images of the sun, moon, and other creatures; and sometimes representations intended to remind them of the true God, as an universal benefactor; to whom

whom, in the Acts, we are told they had an altar.

The true definition, therefore, of an idol, is not merely that it is a representation of that which has no being; but in that it is become an object of religious worship, though it be not God. Every image, therefore, as soon as it is adored, becomes an idol; and those who worship it are idolaters.

They are given up to a strong delusion, both the makers and worshippers of these false gods. *They that make them are like unto them, and so are all they that put their trust in them.* Ps. cxv. 8.

If they urge that many miracles have been performed by their images, so say the Heathen likewise. Does not Cicero (in Verrem) speaking of the image of Ceres, the supposed daughter of Saturn and Ops, and mother of Proserpine, thus express himself;—"Many prodigies declare its virtue and divinity?" Does not Virgil, Georg. 1st, tell us that after the murder of Cæsar, the ivory and brazen images (as is pretended of many of those in esteem among the modern Romanists) wept and sweated? and is it not well known that the Grecians used to set up in tables the miraculous cures performed by their God Æsculapius, as the Papists to  
P this



this day record the wonderful cures performed by their images, as well as their saints? and does not St. Austin say,—Ecclef. c. 16. “Let them hear what wonderful things done, or seen, the Pagans report of their gods; and yet the gods of the Heathens are but devils.”

At the same time it is observable, that though the worship of images is unquestionably of Pagan origin, we find, nevertheless, that the more wise and intelligent even among the Heathens disapproved of it. Thus Varro (as quoted by St. Austin, de Civit. Dei. L. 4. c. 31.) an Heathen philosopher, from the very dictates of Nature, had learned and professed the contrary doctrine. “The gods (saith he) are better and more purely worshipped without images.”

But to proceed;

Were it indeed true that these kind of miracles had not ceased long before the Christian Church was thus contaminated with idolatry, still are we not to credit even miracles, in opposition to the Word of God. But miracles amongst the Papists never offer themselves to public view, as if they were intended to convince the senses, as the wonderful works of Christ and his Apostles formerly did; but they are done in corners; and we have the bare  
words

words of the Priests for the performance of them. Let us, therefore, no longer doubt but that these pretended miracles are either *pious frauds*, as they choose to call them, that is cheats of their teachers; the illusions of Satan, as in the days of Heathenism; or the lying wonders of Antichrist, as spoken of by the Apostle, II. Theff. 2. 9.

Neither ought our adversaries to argue in favour of this practice from the pretended usefulness of images, or outward figures, as helps to devotion, as raising the mind, by means of the senses, to a just apprehension of spiritual objects; for the effect is quite the reverse of what is pretended; the mind, in consequence of these false representations, being sunk to the grossest conceptions. No painter, for instance, or statuary, can possibly frame any resemblance of the Divine Nature or Essence (that attempt being as vain as it is impious) and therefore he must have recourse either to his own invention, or that of other men; and in proportion as the fancy of these artists may vary, so many various representations, all equally inadequate, must there of course be found of the pretended objects of adoration. In consequence of this, men may fall prostrate before any image, under pretence of worshipping some spiritual being.

The truth is, that the bias of human nature lies to sense, and to form gross conceptions of incorporeal objects: so that instead of gratifying these, we ought to wean our minds from them as much as lies in our power. Even speculative, and otherwise intelligent men, feel that, in this, Nature grows too hard for them; but so apt are the bulk of mankind to fall headlong into these conceits, that, to provide the means for their encouragement seems too like laying snares for their seduction from the worship of the true God.

But whatever advantage the Romanists may pretend to derive from this material worship, it is sufficient that the practice itself is unlawful: and we are not to *do evil, even that good may come.*

It is strictly prohibited by the Divine Law, and that to Christians as well as to the Jews. Our Saviour came to establish the Moral Law. We are commanded to *flee from idolatry, to abstain from pollutions of idols, and to worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him.* We need not these beggarly elements to draw us to the contemplation of the Divine Nature; for *no one cometh to me (saith our Saviour) except the Father draw him: nor can any one come to the Father, but by Christ.*

Let

Let them not plead their use of images merely as memorials; since their own Church declares them fools that say so: nor, again, that their intention is innocent, since the act itself is literally forbidden; and as well might every drunkard argue, that actual intemperance is no crime in him, because he went into company without absolutely intending to drink to excess.

Knowing, then, that so long as the second Commandment stands upon record, their heinous guilt of wilfully offending against so strict and plain a precept, is not to be palliated, they have recourse, at last, to the most vain and fruitless, as well as the most indefensible expedient of attempting to blot out the hand-writing that is against them. A tacit acknowledgment of their guilt, to which is added that of diminishing the Law of God, liable to a punishment no less dreadful than *blotting out of the Book of Life*. Rev. xx. 19.

Thus, in most of their catechisms and manuals now in use, as well as in that Summary of Christian Doctrine, as it is entitled, printed for T. D. 1673, prepared to be dispersed after an intended massacre, as in another publication by Father James Ledesma, a Jesuit, printed by permission, in 1609, and 1624: in these the second Commandment is entirely omitted, and in the



last mentioned compendium, the fourth may be said to share the same fate, since what should be the fourth, runs thus: *Remember to sanctify the holy days.* But not a word of the sabbath, or the reasons of its institution, as laid down in the commandment itself.

Thus, in defiance of another divine prohibition in the Decalogue, which says, *Thou shalt not steal,* they have acted like malefactors, who, to avoid condemnation, should find means to convey away the statute book.

Thus impiously have they varied the phrases in the Decalogue: as if they could devise expressions more clear and significant, than those which were written by the finger of God. Thus daringly have they omitted the whole of the second Commandment, under pretence that it is unnecessary, as being only an explanation of the first: an explanation, it seems, which so manifestly condemns all kinds of image, or picture-worship, under the severest penalties, that they think it not safe for them to trust their votaries with the perusal of it; *lest they should see with their eyes, or hear with their ears, and be converted:* but as *Demetrius made silver shrines for Diana, which brought no small gain to the craftsmen,* for similar considerations

rations, the modern Romans strain every nerve to support the practice of image-worship; since, *by this craft they have much of their wealth, and thereby suck they no small advantage.* This, and their darling doctrine of infallibility, which must inevitably stand impeached to all the world, should they acknowledge themselves in error, are likely to continue the two grand impediments to their reformation.

What has been said is more than sufficient to prove, that the worship of images, as it is expressly, solemnly, and repeatedly prohibited by God, in his word, so that it was unknown to the primitive church, borrowed from the Heathens, though at the same time condemned by some of them, that it is absurd to reason, contrary to the pure dictates of Nature, a scandal to Christianity, the source of all manner of evils, introduced and supported by falsehood, and maintained, in spite of conscience, for filthy lucre sake.

I shall therefore add but one more testimony on this head, which is from one of their noted Writers already mentioned, and is as follows:—"The Jews abhorred nothing more than images: the law of God, by Moses, forbad them to make images, or to place them in their temples. The Seres, by law, forbad the

“ worship of images. In the temples of  
 “ the Romans, by the decree of Numa,  
 “ 170 years after the building of the city,  
 “ there were no images, either carved or  
 “ painted. Nor did the Persians erect  
 “ statues. But the impiety and folly of  
 “ the Egyptians in this was remarkable.  
 “ From thence it spread into all nations:  
 “ which corrupt custom of the Heathen  
 “ and false religion, when they began to  
 “ be converted to the Christian faith, in-  
 “ fected our religion also, and brought  
 “ into our churches, statues and images,  
 “ and many pompous and barren ceremo-  
 “ nies, of which there was nothing at all  
 “ amongst the primitive and true Christi-  
 “ ans. Hence we began to translate into  
 “ our temples dumb images of our saints,  
 “ and with great adorations to place them  
 “ on the altars of God; and where we  
 “ reckon it impious for man, the true  
 “ image of God to ascend, thither we  
 “ exalt insensible images. To them we  
 “ bow our heads; we give kisses; we  
 “ offer lights; we hang up gifts; we at-  
 “ tribute miracles; in a word, to them  
 “ we go on pilgrimages, to them we  
 “ make vows, to them we pay worship,  
 “ (*illa colimus, ac tantum non adoramus*) nor  
 “ can it be expressed how much supersti-  
 “ tion, not to say idolatry, grows among  
 “ the

“ the ignorant people, by images, while  
 “ the priests wink at it, and get no small  
 “ gain by it. Agrippa de Vanit. scient.  
 “ p. 57.

Finally, my Protestant brethren, how thankful ought we to be that the lot is fallen to us in a fairer ground. Time was, when the deluded people of this land were subjected to the absurdities and impositions of Rome. But, thanks to the Divine Providence, the snare is broken, and we are delivered. Let us then express our gratitude for these signal and invaluable blessings, by our zeal in the support of our church and government.

Let us closely adhere to the doctrine of the Scripture, making that the unerring rule of our lives, and of our worship; lest we yield to superstitious usages, which lead to more ungodliness; and ever be ready to bear our testimony against any addition to, or diminution from the Divine Law. Let us, at the same time, labour to maintain worthy conceptions of the Deity, in our own minds, and learn to worship him in spirit and in truth. And whilst we possess our souls with a just abhorrence of Popery, as the worst enemy to the religion of Christ; let us not fail to pity and pray for our fellow creatures under the Roman yoke, that they may no  
 P 5 longer



longer be led away to these dumb idols, but may speedily turn from the error of their ways, and receive the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Lastly ; let us pray for the utter extirpation of idolatry, and every semblance of it, throughout the world ; and that God may fill the earth with the true knowledge and fear of himself. So may we finally hope for the conversion of all Jews, Infidels and Hereticks, that the name of God be no longer blasphemed, but that his praise and worship may be maintained and extended from generation to generation. To the only true and living God, be all honour and adoration, now and for ever.

LEC-

## LECTURE X.

EZEKIEL 22. 27.

*Destroy souls to get dishonest gain.*

THAT the traffick of indulgences, the scandal of which occasioned the rise and progress of the Reformation, is one manifest proof of the novelty of the Romish religion, is evident from hence, that it owes its birth to three things; none of which were known in the Western Church for many ages, nor are they to this day believed in the Greek, or in any other church except that of Rome: I mean the belief of Purgatory, the doctrine of Supererogation, or a superabundance of good works; of deceased saints, as well as of our blessed Redeemer, which constitutes what is called the Church Treasure: and lastly, the belief that the Pope has sole possession of the keys of that treasure, as well as of the prison of Purgatory.

The Popes, thus availing themselves of the blind credulity of their votaries, set  
P 6 up

up a kind of traffick, wherein the folly of the buyer, or the knavery of the seller, could never be equalled. With this staple commodity of indulgences, it is sufficiently notorious, that the Roman pontiffs have not only filled their own coffers, but have levied and maintained vast armies; many of the foldiers being content, with no more substantial pay, than an indulgence from his Holiness, which grant, they were fully persuaded, conveyed a full pardon of all their sins. With forces raised in this frugal manner, the Popes were enabled to persecute, even to death, all who opposed their innovations. By these means, the innocent Albigenes were massacred; and by the same methods, the Papal tyranny was to have exercised itself against Protestants of every denomination, had it not happened (to the infinite mortification of his Holiness) that the profits arising from the sale of indulgences, were in a great measure embezzled by the collectors, and other officers employed in that scandalous negotiation.

True it is, that in the ancient church, the discipline was such, that they did not readily readmit to their communion, either those who had apostatised, or were otherwise notorious sinners: at the same time it is as well known, that the Bishops, or  
chief

chief pastors in their respective congregations, had power to mitigate, or relax, the sentence of excommunication, as they saw fit: which practice is derived from the example of St. Paul, who having commanded the excommunication of the incestuous Corinthian, 1 Cor. v. 3. upon his humiliation and serious repentance, lest Satan should prevent him, by destroying him, whom he designed to save; he in 2 Cor. 2. shews that it was time to reconcile the penitent offender, and therefore presses the church to release him. Such mitigations of canonical censures as these, were called indulgences, or pardons, even at the first establishment of the Christian Church. But the modern doctrine of indulgences, in the Roman Church, is quite another thing; nothing but the abused name remains. Those primitive indulgences, were *mitigations* of church censures; whereas these are represented as private *satisfactions* to God's justice: those were releases of the living, sometimes at the request of the living; these are, more frequently, discharges to such as are dead; supposed to be rendered effectual by the intercession, or application of the merits likewise of the dead. Should any Romish Divine deny this (as some may do, for they have several different opinions as to indulgences, so little are they in unity among



among themselves) should any of them pretend, that their indulgences are only relaxations of canonical penances, similar to those which were of old decreed in the first council of Nice, in that of Arles, and of Ancyra, he stands confuted by Cardinal Bellarmine's own arguments to the contrary, which are these: First, (says he) there would then be no need of the treasure of the Church. 2. He is of opinion, that they would be rather hurtful than profitable. 3. they could not be granted for the dead. 4. Those who receive indulgences, undergo canonical penance. 5. The form of them does express that they relate to God, and not only to the church. To which may be added, lastly, that these grants extend, generally, to a much longer period than the life of man; to thousands, to hundreds of thousands of years; nay numberless are those instances where the gift of eternal life, together with a most full and plenary pardon of all sins, has been offered by virtue of an indulgence. As to the grant of indulgences of this kind, by Gregory the first, if we except a weak and ridiculous *Legend of Ledgerus*, disavowed by the most candid and intelligent of the Romanists, it is certain that no traces of it can be found, (See *Magister Angularis*)  
 either

either in the writings of St. Gregory, or in *any history* of that age, or any other, that is authentic. So that those who find it necessary to have recourse to Aquinas, for story and record, in this case, would do well to pay some regard to that decision of this, their favourite champion, where he declares in his *sum. part. 3. 9. 48. art. 2.* that, *The sufferings of saints profit the church, not by way of redemption, but by way of example.* What could the most zealous Protestant alledge, more effectually to confute the notion of the imputed merit of departed saints, upon which the treasure of the Church, and consequently the intrinsic value of indulgences, is founded? and in what estimation can we suppose, that these pretended grants were held by this their *Angelical Doctor*, whatever countenance he may seem to give in his writings, to their pretended antiquity?

The truth is, it is more than probable, that Popish indulgences took place 1300 years after Christ, during the pontificate of Boniface the 8th, the inventor of them; of whom it was commonly said, that he entered into the holy chair like a fox, continued in his pontificate like a lion, and died like a dog: besides the heinous crimes of murder and adultery, the King of France convicted him in open Parliament

ment, of simony and usury, and even of holding a secret league with the Saracens. That a man of this character should devise the most unwarrantable means of of amassing wealth, need not much be wondered. Accordingly, he invented a market for the sale of pardons; as if the rich only were to find an entrance into the kingdom of Heaven; and to the poor, the Gospel were not preached.

For that purpose, as we are assured by *Crantzius*, in his time the first jubilee was kept. Fifty years after this, Pope Clement VI. ordered the jubilee to be held every fifty years, which at first was intended to be but once in a century, and published his extravagant Constitution, *Unigenitus, de pœnitentiis et remissionibus*; a new device to bring customers to Rome. But what profits soever might have accrued from this practice, it had not yet passed into a Catholic doctrine; for it was opposed not long before by *Franciscus de Maryonis*, In 4. l. sen. dist. 19. q. 2. and *Durandus*, *Ibid. dist. 20. q. 3.* nor indeed, was it rightly formed for their purposes till the beginning of the 16th century, when the disturbances in Germany, on this very account, obliged Pope Leo X. to order the point to be settled with more precision: who, indeed, sold his pardons

at an inferior price, but boasted, at the same time, what an immense treasure the Church had amassed by the fable of Christ.

We are not to wonder, that by this Father of Christendom, Luther, who exclaimed against the sale of indulgences, was excommunicated for disobedience.

In short the use of indulgences was sometime after finally decreed by the Trent Assembly, as an article of faith, expressed in these general terms. *I do also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ to his Church; and that the use of them is very helpful to Christian people.* This we readily grant, as far as relates to those mitigations of Church censures which were used in primitive times; but by no means can it be said of modern Popish indulgences, either that the power of them was left by Christ to the Church, or that they are in any wise helpful to Christians. Far otherwise, since, as I have already intimated, they are grounded upon error, and supported by the worst of frauds.

The silence of antiquity is in this case sufficient evidence of their novelty; and it were as absurd to look for a direct confutation of this doctrine in the writings of the ancient Fathers of the Church, as to expect in them a confutation of Quakerism, Methodism, or any of those upstart



start schisms, which are but of yesterday. Those primitive Writers knew nothing of indulgences for sins past, present, and to come; grants, by which, for a small sum of money, the offender may obtain forgiveness of a third part of his sins: by raising the price, he may secure not only a plenary pardon of all his sins in this life, and in the next, but, what is still more incomprehensible, on the same person is frequently conferred, if he is willing to pay the accustomed gratuity, two plenary pardons; as if the first were in reality not plenary, and therefore fraudulent.

Further, if Scripture ought to be our rule in any thing, it must be chiefly in those matters which relate to the pardon of sin, the quiet of our consciences, and to a future state. Therefore a doctrine and practice, which have not the least colour from Scripture, in a concern of such infinite importance, ought on this account likewise to be rejected by us.

But though in the Holy Scriptures, or in the writings of the primitive Fathers of the Church, no direct mention is made of such indulgences as are approved by the Roman Church, yet were it easy to produce such passages from either, as might effectually expose and confute those erroneous tenets on which the credit of these pretended

pre  
gar  
par  
all  
vio  
you  
Sha  
Job  
bin  
know  
mif  
from  
Doe  
Isai  
ibin  
rags  
Apo  
offen  
rowe  
grat  
Wor  
that  
upon  
by re  
progr  
forgi  
thoug  
bapti  
Do  
shoul  
shoul

pretended grants is founded. With regard to the superabundant merits of departed saints, to prove that in this respect all boasting is excluded, we have our Saviour's own words; *When you have done all, you are unprofitable servants.* Luke xvii. 10. *Shall a man be just with God?* (says holy Job) *If he contend with him, he cannot answer him for one of a thousand.* Job ix. 3. *Who knows how often he offends?* (says the Psalmist) Ps. xix. 12. *Who can say, I am pure from sin* (says the wisest of men) Prov. 20. 9. Does not that most illuminated Prophet Isaiah affirm that *we are all as an unclean, thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags?* Isai. 64. 6. And does not the Apostle teach us, that *in many things we offend all?* Jam. 3. 2. Or, if the borrowed sentiments of the Fathers be more grateful to the Romanists than the genuine Word of God, does not St. Austin say, that *by reason of sin there is not a just man upon earth, that doth good and sinneth not?—by reason of which defect* (says he) *whatsoever progress we make, yet must we say of necessity, forgive us our trespasses, even after all our thoughts, words, and works, are forgiven in baptism.* Aug. ad Hieron. Epist. 29.

Does not St. Chrysostom say, *though we should die a thousand times, and though we should fulfil all the virtues of the mind, yet do we*

*we nothing worthy of those things which we receive of God. Chry. de compunc. cord. L. 2. To. 5. Who shall murmur (saith St. Bernard) and say we labour too much, seeing no man can answer the thousandth, nay not the least part of his debt?*

If these words of Holy Scripture be true, as no Christian doubts; if these testimonies of the Fathers are to be credited, as no Romanist will deny, then where are these works of supererogation? where is that surplusage of merits and satisfaction of the saints? If all have sinned, and come short, how shall *bankrupts* become *lenders*? or which way shall the *indigent* relieve the *needy*? *God hath laid help on one that is mighty*; why will you lean on the reeds of *Egypt*?

*Bretbren* (saith St. Austin, in epist. Johan. Tract. 1.) *we have Jesus Christ the righteous, for our advocate with the Father. He is the propitiation for our sins. He that holds this, makes no heresy. From whence have schisms arisen? when men say, we are just, we sanctify the unclean; we justify the wicked.*

Christ then being the sole well of the waters of life, from which all satisfaction and reconciliation with the Father, flows, why will you hew out to yourselves broken cisterns, that will hold no water? for, to add

add one more remark on what has been urged on this head, were it true that the saints had a superfluous stock of merit, it by no means follows, that such merit can be imputed to other men: on the contrary, the Apostle teaches us, that every man shall receive according to that which he himself hath done in the body, whether it be good or evil. 2 Cor. 5. 10.

And God hath set it down in his law, expressly, that as the sin of the sinner, so the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself. Ezek. 18. 20.

But, say the Romanists, "Christ (who has a power of satisfying for the sins of all this world, and a thousand others) having made satisfaction for one only, it must be confessed that the remainder of satisfaction is superabundant." *Panigarolla. Lect. ii. p. 2*

In answer to this specious argument, we reply, that the satisfaction of Christ is so perfect, that it is every way sufficient to its appointed ends; and there can be no excess or defect in it, since, to alledge that, would be to charge God foolishly, as there is not any want of what is every way sufficient to redeem all that believe on him, neither have we the slightest intimation from Scripture, from Reason, or from any authority, but the bare assertion  
of



of those whose interest it has evidently been, to deceive in this particular, that any overplus of the merits and satisfaction of our Redeemer was bequeathed to the church, as a saleable treasure, to be disposed of by the Bishop of Rome, for the most sordid purposes.

To this may be added, that the Romish casuists in endeavouring to maintain this doctrine, may not be aware that they entirely destroy that supposition, upon which another of their favourite doctrines, viz. that of *satisfaction* is built. The latter of these implies, that Christ has not satisfied for the temporal punishment of sins committed after baptism; whereas the doctrine of indulgences supposes quite the contrary. A palpable inconsistency for the support of two false and abominable doctrines.

Even of their own Writers, several have given their opinion of Popish indulgences, in a manner which tends but little to justify the practice, or support the doctrine of them.

Some have confessed, that they have no foundation in Scripture or antiquity. Durand. in Sentent. l. 4. dist. 20. q. 3. John Major in Sent. l. 4. dist. 20. The same is affirmed by Cajetan, Dominicus, Soto, and all those who assert that the use of indulgences came into the Church

Church, upon the relaxing the severity of the primitive discipline, which they say continued in use for 1000 years after Christ: not to mention the well-known and express testimonies in this case, of Bishop Fisher, Polydore Virgil, Alphonsus à Castro, &c. to which, if we add that excellent saying of Cardinal Bellarmine, that "in things which depend on the will of God, nothing ought to be affirmed, unless God hath revealed it in the Holy Scripture;" it must then follow, that according to the declared opinion of these persons who assert that the doctrine of indulgences has no foundation in Scripture or antiquity, it can be no other than a notorious cheat, if we would call things by their true names.

Accordingly we are told, by Aquinas and Bonaventure, that some in their church, said that the intention of indulgences was no more than a *pious fraud*.

And after all, to shew what little confidence is placed in the virtue of these pretended grants, by the more intelligent of that communion, Bellarmine himself gives this caution, viz. "that he would not have the people too confident of the effect of indulgences: for though the church may have power to give them, yet they may want their effect on particular persons; and therefore

“ fore (saith he) all prudent Christians do  
 “ so receive indulgences, as withal to satisfy  
 “ God for their sins.”

Some doctrines and practices, it is well known, are sufficiently confuted and exposed, by being barely stated and shewn: and we may appeal to the common reason of mankind, whether this be not one of them: whether the senseless absurdity of it can be exceeded by any thing, except its abominable wickedness.

What is it less than blasphemy, thus to join the pretended merits of sinful men, with the truly meritorious satisfaction of our blessed Redeemer? or to affirm that any man upon earth can dispose of any part of Christ's merits, as he pleases; or what is still more intolerable, to declare, in the face of the whole world, that the most invaluable gift of God, may be bought with money, by offering even eternal life to the highest Bidder.

Should our adversaries tell us, that these abuses were restrained by the Trent Council, particularly the *sale* of pardons; we may well answer, that considering what numberless falsities and prevarications have been proved upon them, no one is bound to believe them. But were the case even as they say, thanks to our Reformation, which in some measure may have reformed popery  
 itself.

itself. Yet, when we consider that even those pretended restraints are wholly referred to the Popes themselves, it were not enough to say that this Council left things no better than they found them: for in fact, this crying abuse, the scandal of which had occasioned the first beginnings and progress of the Reformation, was upon the matter established by a decree, and, in general terms, framed into an article of faith: the correcting of the excesses in the practice of it, being in the end entrusted to the care of those who had been the authors of it, and the chief gainers by it.

Little need be added, to evince the natural tendency of the doctrine of indulgences, as defined by the Romanists, which is not only to relax all public discipline, of which they boast so highly, but secret penance likewise, when shorter methods to peace and pardon may be more easily purchased: not to say that the application to the executing the many trifling performances, to which indulgences are granted (as holding in their hands consecrated beads, or hallowed tapers, at the point of death, &c. &c.) has brought in amongst them such a prostitution of sacred things, that it either must be said, that those are public cheats, and were such from the beginning;

Q



ginning; or that their virtue is long since exhausted, though the pretended grants are perpetual; or, that a man may, on very easy terms, preserve himself, and redeem his friends out of Purgatory, were there in reality such a place. Lastly; may not the Bishops of Rome be justly charged with the most sordid venality towards the rich, and which is far more unpardonable, the most apparent want of humanity to the poor, so long as they can suppose one single soul to remain confined in that place of torment, if the testimony of their own writers deserves credit; who scruple not to declare, that "The Pope, by his absolute jurisdiction, can empty all Purgatory?" *Triumphus quæst. 32. art. 3.*

I shall conclude with these memorable words of St. Austin, which express the general sense of the Fathers, on this head. *God said not, Go to the East, and seek righteousness; sail to the West, that you may receive indulgence. But indulge thy brother, and it shall be indulged to thee: you have need to inquire for no other indulgence to thy sins; if thou wilt retire into the closet of thine heart, there thou shalt find it. All our hope of indulgence is from God, through Jesus Christ.*

And this, my brethren, we may rest assured, is wholly to be obtained through faith in our Redeemer, a sincere Repentance,  
and

and mortification of every inordinate desire, and a resolute perseverance in good works, to the end of our lives; this is the condition of that grace which is offered to all.—*He that endureth to the end shall be saved.* Matth. x. 22.

---

# LECTURE XI.

---

## PART I.

---

I COR. 14. 36.

*What? came the word of God out from you,  
or came it unto you only?*

**I**T is well known that objects of sense, when repeatedly and continually presented, will leave an impression on the minds of men, not easily to be removed; so that, in consequence of this, the most self-evident absurdity is sometimes obtruded on the ignorant and unwary, as a certain and received truth.

Those, for instance, who know little or nothing of Rome, but what they accidentally collect from vague and casual report, or, possibly, the cursory perusal of pamphlets or gazettes, incidentally mentioning *His Holiness*, the *Sacred College*, *Holy Conclave*, and even *the Holy Office of Inquisition*,

*quisition*, may be induced, for want of better information, to mistake the mystical Babylon for an heavenly Jerusalem: and in like manner, those whose ears are perpetually dinned with the ancient and venerable expressions of *Catholic Faith, Holy Fathers, General or Œcumenical Councils, Perpetual Succession, St. Peter's Chair*, and the like, ingeminated at all times by the Romanists, may, by the very sound of such words, though for no better reason, be in some measure disposed to form an advantageous conception of the Romish religion itself; a religion which bids defiance to sense and reason, and is at the same time capable of the most impious abuses: whereas the true Catholic Christian religion, founded on the law of Nature, and compleated by revelations truly Divine, is at as remote a distance from that of the Church of Rome, as the Reformed, or any other religion can be.

If that is most true, as says Tertullian, which is most ancient, it follows, that *That* is really the *Catholic Church*, (in this sense) which best agrees in faith, with the *Primitive Church*. What that faith was, or is, we have no better, *surer*, nor indeed any other *certain* testimony, than that of the Sacred Scriptures. But the Scriptures, we find, are so far from declaring the Ro-



man to be the *Catholic Church*, that they no where give it so much as the name of *Church*, as they do that of *Corinth*, c. 1. and of *Ephesus*, Rev. 1. &c. So that though it is undeniable, that there once was a *true Church* at *Rome*, it seems as if the Holy Ghost, to curb their foreseen arrogance, refused to qualify them with that title ordinarily vouchsafed to others; that they might have no colour or shadow of pretence to exalt themselves above measure. St. Paul, we see, directs an epistle *separately* to *Rome* alone, as he did likewise to the Churches of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, &c. whereas, had the Church of *Rome* been *Catholic* (every where spread abroad, and all Christians obliged to join in her Communion) he had no occasion to write to *other* Churches severally; since in writing to *that* of *Rome*, he had written to them *all*. It is true he tells them that their *faith is spread abroad in all the world*: but, in the same stile of approbation and encouragement, he says to the Church of *Thessalonica*, *Your faith which you have to Godward is spread abroad, &c.* And again, had the Church of *Rome* been esteemed by St. Paul, as all one with the *Catholic*, his Epistle to the *Romans* had then been doubtless intituled *Catholic* (or general) as well as those of St. John, St. Peter, St. James and

and St. Jude; which are therefore so stiled as directed to the churches of Christ in general.

In a word, since by an induction of endless particulars it were easy to prove, and repeatedly to demonstrate, that the *doctrine* of Papists hath neither been taught at all times, nor embraced by *all Orthodox Christians*, nor spread over *all the world*, we may justly conclude, that neither such their doctrine is *Catholic*, nor the professors of it truly to be called *Catholics*. Nor indeed did they, at any time, take upon them to appropriate that title exclusively to themselves, till, in defiance of truth and reason, as well as the current sense of the Holy Scriptures, from whence such *Divine Right* should be proved, Gregory VII, the tyrant Hildebrand, thus arrogantly decreed: "The Church of Rome" was founded only by God; and the "Pope, therefore, is rightly stiled the" Universal Bishop: insomuch that who-soever consenteth not with the Church "of Rome, cannot be a Catholic. Lib. 11. "Ep. 55. *ap. Bin.*"

But as to say *Roman Catholic*, were no less ungrammatical, than to say a *part-whole*, or a *particular-general*; to avoid so palpable a contradiction in terms, such a blunder in the very expression, it has been

alleged, that their Church is *Catholic* in point of *doctrine*, and Roman in point of *discipline*. But so far is this distinction from strengthening their claim, or even clearing the *incongruity*, that it serves but to shew the world, how distinct their discipline is from their doctrine; and on that account, any unprejudiced person might reasonably suspect *both*.

With a view to silence these objections, Pope *Innocent* the third, in the year 1192, expresses himself with more seeming caution, thus; "if the Church (saith he) be  
" called Catholic, as a company consisting  
" of all Christian Churches, so the  
" Church of *Rome* is not to be termed the  
" Catholic Church, but a part thereof:  
" but take the word Catholic, as God  
" is called Universal Lord, because all  
" things are under his dominion, so we  
" say that the church of *Rome*, only, hath  
" all other Churches universally subject  
" unto her."

The decree of Boniface VIII. after the time of Pope Innocent, runs in this manner; "We declare, define, and pronounce, that it is necessary for every  
" one that is to be saved, to be subject  
" to the Pope of *Rome*. Dat. Later. ann.  
" Pont. oct."

Should it be objected that these are the testimonies of particular men, and not of  
the

the  
Pius  
cil o  
rece  
" sw  
" A  
" an  
" I  
" d  
" o  
" an  
" fa  
" ca  
" I  
U  
chise  
fame  
when  
one,  
beca  
vern  
Hea  
H  
ques  
pers  
But  
pher  
mad  
It  
that  
as no

the Universal Church, we have the *Bull* of *Pius IV.* for the confirmation of the *Council of Trent*, which all their Church have received, *nem. con.* "I do firmly believe, " swear, and profess, that the Catholic and " Apostolic *Roman* Church, is the mother " and mistress of all other Churches; and " I do vow, promise, and swear true obedience to the Pope of *Rome*, the Vicar " of Christ, Successor of St. Peter, &c. " and this I hold to be the true Catholic " faith, which, whosoever believeth not, " cannot be saved." Dat. Rom. Ann. " 1564."

Upon this is founded the *Roman* Catechism, published by the authority of the same Pope *Pius*, and the *Council of Trent*, wherein is said, the Catholic Church is one, both because of one faith, and also because it is subject to one invisible Governor, which is Christ, and to one visible Head, the Pope.

Hence it is evident, that the article in question; is the doctrine, not of particular persons, but of the whole *Romish* Church. But how new, how false, and how blasphemous this doctrine is, may be easily made to appear!

It is a truth which no one can question, that he only can enjoin an article of faith, as necessary to Salvation, who can create



a soul, and afterwards make a Gospel, or testament to save this soul ; and then, give unto that soul the gift of faith to believe this Gospel, and next institute a Sacrament for the confirmation of that faith ; and in the end, bestow salvation upon the same faithful believer.

That this article, then, was not instituted by Christ, or his Apostles, is evident. For the only form of faith said to be composed by the Apostles, according to Popish writers, is what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, or Symbol, in which we do not find one word of the *Roman Church*. That the most careful distinction ought to be observed, between what is called the *Catholic*, and the *Roman Church*, is manifest, for this reason, because the one may, and has existed without the other, even in the account of Baronius, that celebrated advocate for Popery. In the year of our Lord 45, St. Peter was still Bishop of *Antioch*, and yet, the same Historian affirms that this creed was composed in the year 44.

*Genebrand*, another Chronologer, affirms that there were eleven years between the framing of the Apostles' Creed, and the first foundation of the Church of *Rome* (as is pretended) by St. Peter. Would it not then be a strange, as well as a cruel sentence

sentence, to consign all the primitive Christians and Martyrs to endless perdition, for not believing in the Church of *Rome*, when at that time there was no such Church in being? and together with these, even such as in the opinion of the *Romanists* are saved, namely, Catecumens, and persons unjustly excommunicated; a manifest inconsistency in their own principles. Nor is this all; for this tenet unavoidably excludes the Saints triumphant in Heaven, which were ever declared to constitute one part of the Catholic Church, as is acknowledged by the Trent Catechism, part 1 ch. 10. unless some would blasphemously suggest, that the triumphant members of the church are, and ought to be subject to its militant members here below: St. Peter to the Pope; Heaven to Earth.

To these absurd and impious deductions, which are to be drawn from this gross depravation of the Apostles' Creed, may be added, that this genuine maxim of Popery falsely condemns, to eternal perdition, the Fathers of the Council of Nice, of the first Council of Constantinople, of Ephesus, of Chalcedon, of the second of Constantinople, of the sixth, seventh and eighth general Councils, as also the Churches of Asia; together with their Catholic Bishops in the days of Pope Victor; the Churches of Africa, Numidia, and

Mauritania, in the days of St. Cyprian, and St. Cyprian, himself; the same churches in the days of St. Austin, that Father likewise included. In fine, it anathematizes the best emperors, who anciently opposed the unwarrantable usurpations of Popes and Papists, and even the first and best Popes who acknowledged subjection to the emperor of their times. So far then is it from being true, that *all Christianity was first planted in the world by the missionaries of the Church of Rome*, that 'tis manifest that Christianity was planted in the Eastern parts of the world, and divers eminent Churches of Christ formed and settled there, before the Church of Rome had a being, and whilst the Tarpeian hill was covered with a thick fog of *Paganism*. What man can be ignorant, who has perused the Scriptures, that the Christian religion was first established in Jerusalem? that there a numerous Church was settled; and St. James, the brother of our Lord, by the hands of the Apostles (and, as many of the ancients tell us, by the immediate order of Christ himself) constituted Bishop? This was the truly Mother Church; that primitive assembly of Christians, which ancient churches themselves must acknowledge to be more ancient. From this seminary of Christianity, many other Churches, we know, were planted in Judea,

Acts

Act  
15  
of A  
call  
obse  
prea  
the  
29.  
Rom  
S  
plan  
St.  
terv  
the  
T  
reig  
cou  
the  
had  
Pau  
Eas  
pel  
As  
cor  
of  
pre  
lear  
tati  
Pau  
self  
the  
unt

Acts 9. 8. in Samaria, Acts 8. 5, 6, 14, 15. in Syria, and particularly in the city of Antioch, where the Disciples were first called Christians. Acts 11. 26: And it is observable, that all this while, the Apostles preached the Gospel to none but those of the Jewish Nation, or religion. Acts 11. 29. At the same time that the city of Rome lay in darkness.

Should it be objected, that all these plantations in the East, were made by St. Peter, who, it is pretended, was afterwards Head of the Church of Rome, the answer is easy.

This plea, were it ever so true, is foreign to the purpose; because these things could not be done by St. Peter, as Head of the Church of Rome, before that Church had a being. But this is not all; for St. Paul also planted some Churches in the Eastern parts of the world, before the Gospel was preached in the city of Rome. As soon as he was converted, which, according to Eusebius, was in the 19th year of Tiberius, he went into Arabia, and preached the Gospel; and this, as the learned have observed, was the first plantation among the Gentiles, made by St. Paul: Gal. 1. 17. Afterwards, (as he himself tells us, Rom. 15. 19.) he preached the Gospel from Jerusalem, round about unto Illyricum; and that so as he strove  
to



to preach it where Christ was not yet named, nor the foundations of Christianity laid by others. Ver. 20. 21.

The truth is, St. Paul planted more Churches in the Eastern and Western parts of the world, than St. Peter, or any other of the Apostles besides; more even than all the rest of the Apostles put together; for he *laboured more abundantly* than they all 1 Cor. 15. 10. St. Peter himself not excepted.

Can it, then, be thought, that St. Paul planted all these Churches as the missionary of St. Peter, the vainly supposed Head of the Church of Rome? whoever is so confident, or so ignorant as to affirm this, St. Paul himself shall refute him; who solemnly declares, that he received not his commission from any man on earth, but immediately from Christ himself. Gal. 1, 11, 12. That, as soon as he was converted by the Heavenly vision, he betook himself to his work of preaching the Gospel; as not conceiving it necessary to go up to Jerusalem, to take a commission from St. Peter, or any other of the Apostles residing there, whose faces he saw not, till three years after. ver. 15, 16, 17, 18. That St. James, St. Peter, and St. John, the three pillars of the Church at Jerusalem, upon conference, added no-  
thing

thing unto him, viz. either of instruction, or commission, either of knowledge, or authority. Gal. 2. 6. That when these three Apostles saw that the *Gospel of the Uncircumcision* was committed unto him, as the *Gospel of the Circumcision* was unto Peter; they gave him the right hand of fellowship. v. 7, 8, 9. What can be more plain than these words? For, according to the suppositions of the Romanists, it should have been said, that the headship of the whole Church was committed to St. Peter, part of the government whereof, viz. that which concerned the Circumcision of the Jewish Church, he kept to himself; and committed the other, that respected the Gentile Christians, to St. Paul. But the words are quite otherwise: St. Peter had his share of inspection into the Church, committed to him, and St. Paul his, and neither of them from the other, but both from Christ.

Hence it is plain, that St. Paul, by whom most of the first plantations of Christianity in the world were made, was no missionary of the church of Rome, or of St. Peter, considered as Head thereof, or in any other relation: and consequently, that position which has been advanced with so much confidence, by a Champion of the Roman cause, is a palpable untruth,  
viz.

viz. That *all Christianity, over the whole world, was first planted by missionaries and Apostles, sent by, and from the Heads of the Roman Church.* See Catholic Scripturist. And if no Church be Catholic, but by it's dependance on, or derivation from the Church of Rome, then the first and most noble plantations of Christianity in the East were no true and Catholic churches, because they were made such churches as they were, before that of Rome had a being. And if it be answered, that the Church of Rome had then a being in her Head, St. Peter, by whom, or by whose authority those Eastern plantations were made; I have already observed, that St. Peter could not be considered as actually the Head of the Church of Rome, before that Church existed. Neither again, if St. Peter was ever head of the Church at Rome, could he be so much so, as he was head of some other churches, to which he bore a more especial relation, as the Apostle of the circumcision: to which, we may add, that the Churches, planted by St. Paul, were as truly Catholic and Apostolic Churches, as any planted by St. Peter. All these things are plain and evident; and whosoever doth not wilfully shut his eyes against the clear light of the Holy Scriptures, and right reason, cannot but acknowledge

know  
ledge  
and  
to a  
rity,  
Chur  
T  
willi  
othe  
the  
that  
of t  
Chri  
was  
Chr  
on t  
was  
this  
this  
den  
thei  
law  
and  
eme  
15.  
cop  
with  
oth  
fide  
(a p  
nou

knowledge them; and being acknowledged, they for ever destroy the senseless and arrogant pretences of the Romanists to a pre-eminence, a primacy of authority, and jurisdiction inherent in their Church over all other Churches in the world.

That prerogative of honour, which we willingly grant to some Churches, before others, was doubtless originally due to the Mother, or Original Church: such, that of Rome was not, but, indeed one of the younger daughters of Sion. The Christian Church, planted at Jerusalem, was really and truly, the seminary of all Christianity, over the whole world. And on this account the prerogative of honour was originally due to her; and not upon this account alone; for, in the first place, this Church was the more constant residence of the Apostles, wherein they held their Councils, from whence they issued their laws and decrees to the other Churches; and to which the other Churches, upon emergent difficulties, had recourse.—Acts 15. 1, 2, 6, 7, &c. Secondly, that Episcopal See at Jerusalem was constituted with such circumstances as agree to no other Church of the Christian world besides. St. James, the brother of our Lord (a person by that relation the most honourable) was made the first Bishop there,  
and



and in the whole Christian world; and that by an assembly of the Holy Apostles, under whose inspection, and in the place of whose residence, he was to execute his office; and that, as I have said, (if we will credit the united testimonies of several very ancient writers) by the express order of Christ himself. See *Henr. Vales. Annot. in Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 7. c. 19.* Upon these accounts, Eusebius tells us it was, that a strange kind of veneration was given to the very throne, and episcopal chair of St. James, kept at Jerusalem, even to his days, by certain superstitious Christians, who, if they had dreamt of an infallible chair, left by St. Peter, at Rome, would doubtless have paid their homage there. Lastly, it is certain, that a kind of pre-eminence, or precedence, is every where in Scripture given to the Jews, (by reason of the covenant of God to their fathers) before the Gentiles in the kingdom of the Messiah, and in the participation of those benefits which accrue to mankind, by Christ Jesus, and his Gospel, of which, although the Gentiles were no less partakers than the Jews, yet in this order they were dispensed; to the *Jew first, and then to the Gentile.* And St. Paul tells us, that it was necessary that the Gospel should be first preached unto them.

Acts

Acts  
was  
Prin  
Chri  
we f  
the  
amo  
of  
ther  
due  
that  
of J  
tles,  
reta  
the  
Chu  
(in  
hon  
anc  
othe  
upo  
the  
wor  
ties  
from  
Chu  
con  
cal  
ber  
J  
gan

Acts. 13. 46. The Church of the *Jews* was then the *elder Sister*, and this right of *Primogeniture* she lost not by becoming Christian, which she must have done, if we suppose her to have been subjected to the Church of *Rome*, or any other Church among the Gentiles. The chief Church of the Circumcision, was *Jerusalem*; and therefore, as such, the pre-eminence was due to her. And accordingly we find, that although this first and famous Church of Jerusalem, not very long after the Apostles, lost much of her real dignity; not retaining so much as the jurisdiction of the Churches of Palestine; yet still all other Churches, for a long time, acknowledged (in words at least) a special respect and honour due to that see; and some of the ancients have termed it the Mother of all other Churches; even the throne of Christ upon earth; and the governors thereof, the princes of all other Christians in the world; and, which is more, in difficulties about rites and customs, have appealed from other Churches, even the Roman Church itself, to the primitive orders and constitutions settled in that first Apostolical Church. All which is evident by numberless express testimonies.

Justly, then, may we bespeak the arrogant Romanists in the words of St. Paul,  
to

to the Corinthians. *What? came the word of God out from you, or came it unto you only?* No, as you were not the *first*, so you are not the *only* Persons that received the Gospel, and became a Christian Church: there are many other Churches besides, enjoying equal privileges with yourselves. It were no difficult matter to apply this, and discern how much more deeply the present Church of Rome is concerned in this expostulation of the Apostle.

Should they ask us whether we subscribe to the Churches which flourished in former ages? we answer, yes; to the Church of Jerusalem, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets; to the Church of Antioch; to the Church of Ephesus, and to all those renowned Churches that we read of, in the Epistles written by the Apostles, even to the *old Roman Church* (*whose faith was once spoken of throughout the whole world, Rom. 1. 8.*) to which the present Church of Rome bears no resemblance. In a word, we approve of all those Churches mentioned in history, which being planted by the Apostles, have retained the seed whole and sound. So long as they continued in the Apostles' doctrine, they were true Churches; and with such we do always agree—to such we shall always subscribe.

LEC.

---



---

# LECTURE XI.

---

## PART II.

---

### MATTH. XXIII. 8.

*Be not ye called Rabbi ; for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.*

THE world cannot afford a more deplorable instance of what our Saviour once lamented, as to the wretched state of the once famed city of Capernaum, Matth. xi. 23. than what must appear to every impartial Christian, to be no less amply accomplished in the spiritual condition of Rome. This Church, whose foundation was unquestionably laid by the hands of, at least one great Apostle, St. Paul, and immediately after, raised yet higher by the pastoral care, and cemented with the blood of about thirty Martyrs, who were all Bishops there, has, on these accounts, since her very beginning, ever appeared most



most eminent and respectable amongst Apostolical plantations. Besides this, the City of Rome was the head of many nations, and as it was customary for appeals relating to civil matters to be brought there, this occasioned frequent resorts of Christians, as well as others, from all parts of the empire, to that metropolis, naturally inspiring the people with a veneration of that high seat of power and grandeur; which circumstance, so favourable to the advancement of the dignity and peculiar influence of the Church of Rome, must have added many cubits to her stature, amongst, and even above all other Patriarchal Churches. This Church itself, unavoidably derived a pre-eminence from the secular dignity of so renowned a Capital, and from its extensive jurisdiction; and thus, by degrees, insensibly ensnared the Christians of those times, into an imitation of the civil establishment, which was encouraged by the aspiring Churchmen, then settled at *Rome*, till at length their authority grew, and appeals about Ecclesiastical affairs, were brought thither likewise: So that, without wresting the Scriptures in vindication of their false claim to an universal supremacy, we may, by a cursory view of the state of affairs in the world, at that time, readily account for that

that political primacy, with which the Bishops of Rome so soon became invested; and which has been ever since so shamefully abused, to the infinite scandal of the Christian name.

To proceed in this detail, the ancient Roman Church, being then a city, built upon seven mountains that overtopped the whole world, and, as it were, a *light* burning upon seven conspicuous *candlesticks*, became sufficiently remarkable, and was not undeservedly looked upon as the principal church of the world. This lustre and principality received afterwards, considerable improvements from the conversion of the Emperors; who being then most zealous in propagating religion throughout all parts of their empire, and advising with the Bishops, or Heads of the Church, for their assistance and direction, as to the erecting of Churches, the demolition of Heathen temples, the assembling of general Councils, or, in short, any undertaking for the advancement of Christian piety; it need not be wondered that great notice should be taken of, and addresses from all parts made to those then respectable Prelates, whom the Emperors not only invited to their court, but consulted and confided in, as their bosom counsellors. To these circumstances of  
encou-

encouragement, if we add the abolition of the Heathen Pontificate, with which the Bishops of Rome soon found means to invest themselves, by grafting it into their Church polity, as in their discipline they have since adopted many Heathen rites, we shall be still less surpris'd to find those aspiring Prelates, in a very short process of time, assuming the titles of popes, of pontiffs, and even of sovereign princes, over all the Christian world. If, I say, we consider the nature and singular dignity of that ancient appointment of *Pontifex Maximus*, or superintendant of the *Pontifices* of Heathen Rome, we shall readily perceive, from the near resemblance and conformity of each to the other, that they were framed nearly, if not altogether, on the same model. In the days of Heathenism, this, we learn, was one of the most dignified offices in the commonwealth of ancient Rome. Numa, when he instituted the order, invested himself first, with this dignity; and as the person so invested was declared the judge and arbitrator of divine and human affairs, on this account all the Emperors, after the examples of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, either took upon them the office, or, at least, used the name. And even the Christian Emperors, till the time of *Gratian*,  
 who

who  
 nary  
 here  
 Poly  
 fallib  
 the  
 unde  
 imus.  
 Bu  
 pal t  
 the  
 (like  
 day,  
 with  
 Chun  
 they  
 imus,  
 for th  
 Pont  
 the p  
 vern  
 in th  
 jurisd  
 were  
 Order  
 Th  
 afterv  
 fraud  
 ter a  
 wishe  
 count  
 moun

who refused it, retained this in the ordinary enumeration of their titles. And here it is to be remarked, among others, Polydore Virgil looked upon this as an infallible omen of the authority, which the Bishop of Rome enjoys to this day, under the identical title of *Pontifex Maximus*. Sovereign Pontiff.

But though the foundations of the Papal tyranny were laid upon the ruins of the Heathen Pontificate, yet Rome Papal (like Rome Heathen) was not built in a day, by reason of the opposition it met with, both from the Emperors, and from the Church. The Christian Emperors, when they dropped the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, as incompatible with their religion, for the same reasons that they assumed the Pontifical power at first, (which was for the preservation of their persons and government) still held it, so as to keep in themselves the supreme authority and jurisdiction in all affairs of religion, which were not the immediate exercises of Holy Orders.

That dominion, therefore, which was afterwards obtained, whether by force or fraud, or by both united, was not, till after a considerable time, improved to its wished-for plenitude and extent, on account of the many obstacles it had to surmount.

R



Besides, that such consummate arrogance was diametrically opposite to the religion of the meek and lowly Jesus, who declared that his kingdom was not of this world; it is to be observed, that the Popes were at that time chosen by the people, to whom they were accountable for their administration, as they were to the clergy, for their soundness in the faith, and orthodox doctrine: and moreover, that this election of the Pope, required a confirmation from the Emperor before he could be legally invested in his authority, as is apparent from all history.

Nor did the see of Rome meet with less difficulty in its advancement, from frequent and tedious contentions with the Church of Constantinople for precedence, after the latter was made the capital of the empire. For it is to be remembered, that the Bishop of Rome was not the first who laid claim to universal supremacy; that daring usurpation over the rights of mankind was before attempted, though without success, by John, Patriarch of Constantinople, encouraged by the Emperor's residence in that city; in answer to whose groundless pretence, Gregory, then Bishop of Rome, declared, that though his See had ever retained the precedence

pre  
no  
an  
the  
him  
fore  
E  
cou  
to a  
or U  
Bish  
pria  
vil,  
I m  
stan  
from  
in a  
the f  
Pope  
usurp  
ceed  
migh  
cious  
he co  
of U  
Chri  
Th  
claim  
fact,  
Phoca  
and d

precedence of Constantinople, yet, that no Bishop of Rome had ever assumed such an arrogant title, which he represents as the result of *Luciferian* pride, and declares him who should presume to adopt it, the forerunner of *Anti-Christ*.

But that same circumstance, which encouraged the Patriarch of Constantinople to aspire after the title of Œcumenical, or Universal Bishop, enabled the succeeding Bishops of Rome, in after times, to appropriate to themselves the exercise of the civil, as well as the ecclesiastical jurisdiction; I mean the Emperor's residence at Constantinople, and consequently his absence from Rome. And that very title, which in a manner had been abjured by Gregory the first, was, years after, accepted of by Pope Boniface III. from that traiterous usurper, Phocas, who murdered the preceding Emperor, and his family, that he might ascend the throne; in which atrocious villainy being abetted by the Pope, he could do no less than bestow the title of Universal Bishop upon this Father of Christendom, for his reward.

Thus, that supremacy, which is still claimed by the bishop of Rome, was in fact, introduced. But as that grant of *Phocas*, was but a superiority of order and dignity, without any addition of power

to the Bishop of Rome, over his colleagues, making him only, as some express it, *the first amongst his equals*; his successors, thirsting after a more substantial pre-eminence, and scorning to hold their dignity by so precarious a tenure, began to disown the favour in this manner conferred, to set up for themselves, and to claim an universal supremacy, as inherent by Divine Right in their See, and as derived from St. Peter, as chief of the Apostles, and head of the Church.

Thus was the foundation of the Supremacy changed; and not unwisely; since the former was no ways proportioned to that immense superstructure which they now began to project. And by the success which attended them in one claim, being encouraged to set up another, the Bishops of Rome, availing themselves of the ignorance of the times, the uncommon influence of the Clergy, who now began to have an eye to the fleece more than to the flock, together with those perpetual disputes amongst the European potentates, in those days, who were desirous at any rate, to purchase the friendship of the Bishops of Rome; those ambitious churchmen soon afterwards found means of uniting the sword with the keys, the sceptre with the pastoral staff, and, in

the end, to improve their titular supremacy, into a no less extensive superiority of power and jurisdiction: thus amply verifying that of Our Saviour, that *the children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light.*

Nor need we so much wonder at the insolence of their manners, as well as the arrogance of their pretences, in subsequent times, even to these our days, when we find such frequent instances of the most servile adulation in their votaries, such flattering, and even blasphemous titles, shamelessly bestowed upon them by venal writers of their own communion.

“The Pope is Sole Sovereign of all Christians,” says one *Bzovius de Pontif. Rom. c. 1.* “above all mortals.” *Ibid. c. 3.* “he is God’s supreme vicegerent;” “The universal Judge, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords,” say others. *Scioppius de Eccles. c. 139.* *Mosconius de Majest. Eccl. milit. 1. 7.* “The Judge of Heaven.” *Bzovius c. 32.* And, to sum up all blasphemous prostitutions of sacred titles in one; “THE LORD OUR GOD.” *Gloss. on canon Law. c. cum inter: verb. Declaramus: extrav. De verb. signif.*

This impious gloss was approved and passed by Pope Gregory xiii. *vid. Bullam Jul. 1580.* And thus it still remains in the



Roman (1580) and Paris (1612) editions. Add to this, that the inquisitors, who, in their expurgatory indices, have expunged such sentences as these; *Abraham was justified by faith* p. 99. *Christ is salvation to those that believe.* p. 112. *Christ is our righteousness.* *ibid.* *We are all sinners.* *ibid.* Madrid. 1667; have suffered this glaring impiety to remain untouched, in the last and best editions of their canon law.

The Jesuit, Cardinal Bellarmine, scruples not to say, that “on the Pope’s supremacy the whole of Christianity depends:” and accordingly, with a view to exhibit some colour of vindication for so ancient a primacy, on which, in fact, the whole fabric of Popery is founded, the champions for the Papal pre-eminence, to prove it of Divine right and Institution, alledge that our Saviour conferred a power on St. Peter over the rest of the Apostles, and to him, as his Vicar, or Vicegerent, committed the government of his Church throughout the world; and that Peter, being Bishop of Rome, the Pope has the same power and authority conveyed down to him, as his successor.

To make out this plea, it is doubtless incumbent on them, to prove that St. Peter had this power; that he was Bishop of Rome; and, moreover, that the Popes

are  
and  
one  
and  
tur  
mu

Chr  
not  
rece  
ther  
from  
of  
ther  
Epi  
as t  
dou  
poin  
is f  
Pet  
lusi  
look  
ting  
may  
in t  
by  
Pet

N  
Chu  
cier  
beli

are his successors, and have the same power and authority lodged in them. If any one of these points fails, their rock is split, and the whole of that magnificent structure, which they have erected upon it, must inevitably fall to ruin.

Every intelligent and unprejudiced Christian will allow, that whatever cannot be proved by Scripture, is not to be received as an article of faith. So far then is it from being capable of a proof from Holy Writ, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome, that it does not appear from thence, that he ever was there. His Epistle is dated from Babylon in Assyria, as the learned agree. For, though no one doubts but Rome is the mystical Babylon, pointed out in the book of Revelation, it is far from probable, that the Apostle St. Peter would affect the same mystical allusion in an historical date, as might be looked for in abstruse and prophetic writings. This, to any reasonable enquirer, may serve as an answer to the only text in the whole Bible, that has been adduced by the Papists, as a Scripture proof of St. Peter's ever having been at Rome.

Many candid and learned writers of the Church, it is true, lest the credit of ancient history should suffer, from the disbelief of this fact, have granted it; but

they have rather granted, than proved it; nor, in reality, can any better authority be alledged, in confirmation of St. Peter's ever having been at Rome, than the fable of his going there in pursuit of Simon Magus, with whom he is said to have engaged in a trial of skill, in working miracles; which account Eusebius relates, as founded on no better authority than *Papias*, whom he at the same time represents as credulous, illiterate, and of mean judgment.

But further to confirm the certainty of this fact, the Romanists refer us to the Clementine epistles, where we find the following inconsistency.

It is there said, that St. Peter was at Rome in the second year of Claudius, and lived there twenty-five years; but Christ was crucified in the eighteenth year of Tiberius, who reigned five years after our Saviour's passion. Caligula reigned four years, and Claudius two; which make eleven, before St. Peter is said to have gone to Rome; at the same time it is to be observed, that in the eighteenth year of our Lord, St. Paul found St. Peter at Jerusalem. Gal. 1. Nor is this the only mistake in their Chronology, which proves these epistles to be counterfeit; for Clement, as bishop, could not, as it  
is

is pretended, be supposed to write these epistles to St. James at Jerusalem; for certain it is, that he was dead before Clement was Bishop.

I have said, that many learned writers have granted, that possibly St. Peter might have been at Rome. Such are *Arnobius*, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Eusebius*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Jerom*, and *Justin the martyr*. These have all supposed the fact: but, as they took it up on tradition, their authority can be of no more weight, than tradition itself; which, had they duly examined, they would not, perhaps, have so readily pinned their faith upon it. False and lying traditions are of an early date; and the greatest men, have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them. How many traditions, after having prevailed for ages, without being questioned, were, upon the Reformation, when men took the liberty to examine what they believed, rejected, for shame, by the Church, and degraded into popular errors! But that of St. Peter's having been at Rome, and the first Bishop of that city, was a tradition which concerned the Romanists so nearly, that it must be maintained at all events; and both truth and history must fall a sacrifice.



Here it is worthy our observation, what little regard the Popes themselves have shewn to tradition, though received by the greatest lights of the Church, when it did not tend to promote the interest and aggrandizement of their see. Of this we have a glaring instance in a parallel case; for, if St. Peter, according to tradition, travelled to Rome; so did St. Paul, according to tradition, travel into Spain. The former tradition was received by the writers already mentioned, and the latter by some of the same writers, viz. *Cyril, of Jerusalem, Jerom, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Gregory the Great*, and many others; yet such a tradition was rejected, perhaps not unjustly, by Pope Innocent I. who would not allow St. Paul to have ever been in Spain. Have we not then, an equal right to question, or even to deny, St. Peter's ever having been at Rome? Are not the authorities at least equal on both sides? Why then is it required, that the travels of one Apostle should be looked upon as an article of faith, so much so, that it has been daringly affirmed, that no Christian ever doubted it, while those of the other, are deemed fabulous? The reason is too notorious!

But in this controversy, the silence of St. Paul, in particular, if duly attended to, must appear to every unbiassed reasoner

soner, a far more convincing proof, of St. Peter's having never been at Rome, than all the authorities that have been yet alledged, are, of his having been there.

That Apostle, while at Rome, had frequent opportunities of mentioning his fellow Apostles, and fellow labourers; and yet, naming several others, we find that, as to St. Peter, he is totally silent. From Rome, he wrote to the *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians*, to *Timothy*, and to *Philemon*, without ever mentioning Peter; or sending any salutation from him; nay, it is certain, that St. Peter was not at Rome when the Apostle of the Gentiles wrote to the *Colossians*: for mentioning *Tychicus*, *Onesimus*, *Aristarchus*, *Marcus* and *Justus*, he adds, *these alone, my fellow workers unto the kingdom of God, have been a comfort to me.* Peter was not there, when St. Paul wrote his second epistle to Timothy, where he says, *At my first answer, no man stood with me, but all men forsook me.* Nor was he there immediately before St. Paul's death, when the time of his departure was at hand, for he tells Timothy, that *all the brethren greet him*, and naming *Eubulus*, *Pudens*, *Linus*, and *Claudia*, he omits *Peter*, who, we may thence conclude, could not be there. And yet, in defiance of these asseverations  
of

of the Apostle, it is a received tradition in that Church, which is determined to receive any report that tends to its aggrandizement, that St. Peter, was not only at that time in that Metropolis, but confined and bound there, in the same prison with St. Paul. Lastly, as St. Paul, in writing from Rome, sends no salutation from Peter, so in writing to *Rome*, he greets many others, but never mentions him. Who then would not chuse, rather to reject a tradition, so ill grounded, than suppose St. Paul guilty of so unfriendly and unaccountable an omission?

After what has been said, it were needless to add, that it is at least very much to be doubted, whether St. Peter was ever at Rome. On the contrary, whenever the disproof of this fact has been attempted, it has been made to appear, even to demonstration, that this Apostle never could have been there.

Supposing, nevertheless, that it was, in reality, an indisputable fact that St. Peter was at Rome; still are there so many incoherences, inseparable from the idea of his being Bishop of that place, as the Papists would prove, that no considerate, unprejudiced person, could ever suppose that to have been the case.

Was

Was it not by agreement between this Apostle, and St. Paul, that the latter should preach to the Gentiles, and was not Peter, whose department was, in a great measure, confined to the Jews, on that account called the Apostle of the Circumcision? Accordingly we find, that even his very Epistles, addressed to the dispersed Jews, are neither directed to *Rome*, nor dated from thence; as, on the other hand, St. Paul's were: and it were evidently a degradation of the Apostolical dignity, that one of the twelve, should become a Bishop of a single diocese; that instance of St. James, at Jerusalem, being a singular case; nor is it certain that he was an Apostle; at least not one of the twelve. But allowing that he was; there was, doubtless, a special reason, why one of the Apostles should be appointed to reside at *Jerusalem*, that city being the Metropolis, the Fountain, the Centre of the Christian Religion. But there was no special reason, why an Apostle should constantly reside at any other place, nor does it appear that any did. St. Peter, in particular, could not reside constantly at any one place, since to him, as *the Apostle of the Circumcision*, was committed the charge of converting the dispersed Jews, in all parts of the world.

But



But were it even true, that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome; still, the right of *succession* in the *Popes* remains to be proved. No man can be said to succeed another in that, which such other person never possessed. St. Peter said, *Silver and gold have I none.*

How then, with any propriety, can the treasure of the Roman Church be called St. Peter's Patrimony? But, as St. Peter could say to the lame, arise and walk; let the bishops of Rome prove openly, and not by miracles done in a corner, that they are genuine successors of this great Apostle in that respect, and we may then believe them. But as more would be superfluous, I shall confine the remainder of what I have to offer, on the head of Papal Supremacy, to the consideration of those texts of Scripture, which the Romanists urge in proof of the primacy of St. Peter; for if it can be proved, that he was not invested with such supremacy as is pretended, their plea of a succession to him, in that primacy of authority and power, as well as order and dignity, will then be vain and useless.

The chief text which the Papists abuse, to give a colour to this false claim of the Pope's Supremacy, is Matth. xvi. 18. 19. *Thou art Peter; and upon this rock will I build*

*build my Church, &c. and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.* As if our Saviour had said, *Thou art what thy name imports, which I have given thee, with respect to this solid faith thou hast now confessed; upon which, as upon a rock, I will build my Church by your ministry; and particularly by thine, who shalt have the honour to lay the first stone of it in the Gentile world.* Thus St. Austin expounds the words in many places; and, that the rock, upon which Christ said he would build his Church, was not Peter, but the faith which Peter then confessed, is the current sense of those fathers of the Church, whom the Romanists are bound to follow, both by the doctrine of the Council of Trent, and, by the form of that *oath, or profession of faith*, which Pope Pius IV. drew up and enjoined according to the mind of that Council. See *Aug. de Verb. Dom. S. 13. Nazianzen, de Vet. Test. Cyril, de Trin. l. 4. Chrysost. Hom. 55. Ambr. in Eph. 2. Hilary, de Trin. l. 2. &c. &c.*

Some interpret this of our Saviour himself; as on another occasion he says, *destroy this temple*, meaning his own body. But were it true that St. Peter's person was the rock here alluded to, still no supremacy over the rest of the Apostles could

could with any shew of reason, be inferred from thence, since the metaphor of a rock, may imply *stability* and *support*, but not *Jurisdiction* or *authority*.

But, as in five verses further, in this chapter, during the same interview, our Saviour addresses Peter in very different terms, *get thee behind me, Satan, &c.* we cannot suppose, that Christ intended to found his Church upon him personally, especially when we recollect, that after this, it was, that St. Peter's fear prevailed over his firmness; he thrice denied his Master; he failed for a time; and, therefore, could never be thought a foundation of sufficient stability, upon which that Church should in time be erected; against which, our Saviour himself declared, that the powers of darkness should not prevail. On the contrary, St Paul informs us, that Jesus Christ himself is the chief corner stone, in this edifice; and, that other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus. Thus much for St Peter, as a rock. As to what our Saviour further says, *I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*; this is a promise, made to all the Apostles, in the person of St. Peter, who had answered in the name of them all, as appears, John xx. 23. where this promise

promise is *performed*, and power given them *all equally*, of administration in his Church. All parties understand the power of the keys, as equivalent to that of binding and loosing; which is added by our Saviour in the next words. But this *very power* is given to *all* the Apostles in the very same words, as we find in the next chapter but one, Matth. xviii. But, say the Romanists, our Saviour besides this, said to St. Peter, *Feed my sheep*, and that, three times successively. But does feeding Christ's sheep, imply a right to lord it over God's heritage?

In the sense it is here evidently to be taken, that of instructing the ignorant and uninformed, in the doctrines of Christianity, or in our Saviour's extensive and general commission, to make proselytes of *all nations, teaching them to observe, &c.* and, to *preach the Gospel to every creature*, were not all the apostles equally authorised and commanded to do this? As for our Saviour's thrice questioning St. Peter, whether he loved him? and as many times repeating this command, which is given in plainer terms to all the Apostles, it seems no improbable conjecture, what many writers have suggested, that our Saviour, in urging this question, more than once, had an eye to this Apostle's threefold



threefold denial of him ; and might intend this, not only as a mild reproof of his unmanly desertion of him, but a caution, likewise, against a subsequent failure.

Another plea, in favour of St. Peter's primacy, as urged by the Romanists, is this ; that in the council held at Jerusalem, as mentioned in Acts xv. this Apostle is supposed to have presided ; for he spoke first. But this we find was not so : for it is said, that *when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said.*—Nor did he speak last ; for, after he had done, Paul and Barnabas declared the conversion of the Gentiles, by their means ; and, after they held their peace, St. James, who was Bishop of Jerusalem, where the Council was held, did, as President, resume what had been said by St. Peter, and others, and gave his definitive sentence on the whole ; *wherefore my sentence is, &c.* If this had been said of St. Peter, no doubt, much use would have been made of it, by the maintainers of the Papal Hierarchy.

If then it were true, that these passages of Scripture which I have examined, were intended to have been understood in that extent, which is pretended by the Romanists, it is impossible but it must appear in the facts recorded of St. Peter, especially

cially in the part which he bore in the Council of Jerusalem. And facts, it must be allowed, are the surest explanation of words. And it is to be remembered, that we are now speaking only of authority; and what authority one Apostle held over another; for that only, is the point in question. Were it true, that those various gifts and graces with which the disciples of our Lord were severally endowed, or their labours in propagating the Gospel, wherein, one might be more eminent and successful than another, did actually confer a primacy of authority; In this, not St. Peter, but St. Paul had undeniably the preference, for he *laboured more abundantly than they all*. The epistles to the several Churches are mostly his; and his miracles and conversions of Infidels, (not to mention the miracle of his own conversion) take up a much greater part in the Acts of the Apostles, than those of St. Peter.

Nor is St. Paul the only Apostle who might be placed in competition with St. Peter, for Universal Supremacy; were that ever intended, was not St. James, the brother of our Lord, appointed Bishop of Jerusalem, the *mother* at least, if not, at that time, the *mistress* of all Churches? no less favourable might those circumstances.

stances appear, in respect to St. John, who was Christ's favourite disciple; and, as he survived all the Apostles, must be allowed, on that very account, to be the most proper person to be invested with that superiority of jurisdiction, if any man was to be so; since otherwise, he himself, one of the twelve, and the most beloved of those twelve of our Saviour's Apostles, must, after St. Peter's decease, become subject and subordinate to Linus, Cletus, or some succeeding Bishop of Rome, unquestionably his inferior in dignity, if not in personal merit. That power then, which our Lord promised to St. Peter, cannot be understood as meant to him alone, for he did but represent and sustain the person of the Church (as the ancients speak) to which this promise belongs: and, therefore, what our Lord promises to St. Peter, that same thing he afterwards promises to all the Apostles, in the same words. Accordingly, when this promise was fulfilled, he conferred this power on every one of them equally. They all spake with tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.

Were this supremacy of St. Peter an exclusive personal prerogative, the Romanists would find no small difficulty in proving from Scripture, for that is the only rule of our faith, of which faith, according

cording to the decision of our adversaries, this should be one fundamental article; They would, I say, still find no small difficulty in proving, that this personal prerogative descended by virtue of any promise, or engagement, either from our Saviour, or St. Peter, to the succeeding Bishops of Rome. But as no one can be said to succeed another, in that which he never had, the confutation of St. Peter's own claim to supremacy, over the whole Church of Christ, or rather, of that claim which has been made for him, in his name, by designing men, many hundreds of years after his death, must, of consequence, render any enquiry into a right of superiority in power, as derived from him by succession, needless.

As the Scriptures no where point out such a supremacy, even in the Apostolical age, their silence in this respect, is as strong an argument against that doctrine, as the weakness of those pleas evidently is, which the Romanists alledge, in support of what must appear indefensible.

Of so great importance to the Church of Christ must so distinguished and singular an authority be, that it is absolutely necessary, that it should, at the very first institution, be confirmed by the sanction  
of



of a Divine commission ; and that, in the most distinct and perspicuous terms. But so far otherwise do the Scriptures inform us, that such a commission is not to be supported by any arguments drawn from them ; but, on the contrary, there are many clear, and express testimonies against it, in the whole Bible ; but none more full, convincing, and unanswerable, than that reproof of our Saviour to his disciples, when affecting high places. *Ye shall not be so : but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger ; and he that is chief, as he that does serve.* And herein, he proposes his own example for their imitation. *I am among you,* says this their Lord and Master, *as he that serveth.* Luke xxii. 26, 27.

Here it may not be thought superfluous to subjoin, as apposite to the subject in hand, the decision of a learned Prelate of our own Church.

*Archb. Tillotson's Pref. to Dr. Barrow on Supr.* " The Papal Supremacy (upon which Bellarmine hath the confidence to say, *the whole of Christianity depends*) is not only an indefensible, but an impudent cause, as ever was undertaken by learned pens. And nothing could have kept it so long from becoming ridiculous in the

“ the judgement of mankind, but its  
 “ being so strongly supported by a worldly  
 “ interest. For there is not one tolerable  
 “ argument for it, and there are a thou-  
 “ sand invincible reasons against it. There  
 “ is, neither from Scripture, nor reason,  
 “ nor antiquity, any evidence of it; the  
 “ past and the present state of *Christendom*,  
 “ the histories and records of all ages,  
 “ are a perpetual demonstration against  
 “ it: and there is no other ground in the  
 “ world for it, but that now of a long  
 “ time, it hath been, by the Pope’s *Janiza-*  
 “ *ries*, boldly asserted, and stiffly contend-  
 “ ed for, without reason. So that any  
 “ one might, with as much colour, and  
 “ evidence of truth, maintain, that the  
 “ *Grand Seignior* is of right, and for many  
 “ ages hath been acknowledged *Sovereign*  
 “ of the whole world, as that the Bishop  
 “ of Rome is of right, and in all ages,  
 “ from the beginning of Christianity, hath  
 “ been owned to be the *Universal Monarch*,  
 “ and head of the Christian Church.”

Archb. Tillotson’s Pref. to Dr. Barrow on  
Supr.

These, it may be urged, are the words  
 of one, apparently biassed by opposite  
 principles; and, therefore I shall con-  
 clude, with a citation equally applicable,  
 from

from a writer, against whose opinion, no  
 such objection can be urged; he having  
 been, not many years since, a public pro-  
 fessor in three Popish universities, of  
 which Rome was one; and once a firm  
 adherent to the principles and tenets of  
 of that Church. In his Preface to the  
 Lives of the Popes, "This work, says he,  
 " I undertook some years since, at Rome,  
 " and brought it down to the Pontificate  
 " of Victor, that is, to the close of the  
 " second century. As I was then a most  
 " zealous champion for the Pope's supre-  
 " macy, which was held as an article of  
 " faith, by the body to which I belong-  
 " ed, my chief design when I engaged  
 " in such a work, was to ascertain that  
 " supremacy, by shewing, century by  
 " century, that from the Apostles' times  
 " to the present, it had ever been ac-  
 " knowledged by the Catholic Church.  
 " But, Alas! I soon perceived that I had  
 " undertaken more than it was in my  
 " power to perform. Nay, while, in or-  
 " der to support and maintain this cause,  
 " I examined, with particular attention,  
 " the writings of the Apostles, and of  
 " many pious and learned men, who have  
 " flourished in the three first centuries  
 " of the Church, I was so far from  
 finding

“ finding any thing that seemed to  
 “ countenance such a doctrine, that, on the  
 “ contrary, it appeared evident beyond  
 “ all dispute, that, during the above-  
 “ mentioned period of time, it had  
 “ been utterly unknown to the Christian  
 “ world.

“ In spite, then, of my endeavours to  
 “ the contrary, (continues he) reason get-  
 “ ting the better of the strongest prejudi-  
 “ ces, I began to look upon the Pope’s  
 “ supremacy, not only as a prerogative  
 “ quite chimerical, but as the most im-  
 “ pudent attempt that had ever been  
 “ made; I say, in spite of my endea-  
 “ vours to the contrary; for I was  
 “ very unwilling to give up a point,  
 “ upon which I had been taught, by  
 “ Bellarmine, that the whole of Chris-  
 “ tianity depended; especially in a coun-  
 “ try where a man cannot help being  
 “ afraid, even of his own thoughts;  
 “ since, upon the least suspicion of his  
 “ only calling in question any of the  
 “ received opinions, he may depend on  
 “ his being soon convinced by more co-  
 “ gent arguments than any in mood and  
 “ figure.

“ But great is the power of truth, and  
 “ at last it prevailed: I became a pro-  
 “ felyte to the opinion, which I had pro-  
 S posed



" posed to confute, and sincerely abjured  
 " in my mind that which I had ig-  
 " norantly undertaken to defend.—*Ar-*  
 " *chibald Bower's preface to his lives of the*  
 " *Popes.*"

## LECTURE XII.

GEN. XLIX. 6.

*O my soul, come not thou into their secret ;  
unto their assembly, mine honour, be not  
thou united.*

“ I ALSO, without doubt, receive and  
“ profess all other things, delivered by the  
“ Sacred Canons and General Councils,  
“ and especially by the Holy Council of  
“ *Trent* ; and all things contrary to them,  
“ with all heresies condemned, rejected  
“ and cursed by the Church, I likewise  
“ reject, condemn, and curse.”

In this concluding article of the Trent Creed, the credulous and passive Romanist professes an implicit faith in, and obedience to whatever has, at any time been decreed, by what those of that Communion think fit to denominate General Councils. And, indeed, of all pretenders to infallibility, the authority of such collective bodies, when duly assembled, and with every requisite qualifica-

tion, may seem to offer the fairest plea. But, if the decrees in matters of faith of any pretender to infallibility, established at one time, are found to be inconsistent with decrees in matters of faith, which were made at another, by the same authority; if it can be proved, incontestibly, that what have been called *Sacred Canons* and *General Councils*, have contradicted each other; we have then more reason to believe that they have erred, than any man can shew us that they cannot err; since we cannot have more reason to believe any thing, than this, that contradictions cannot be true. These things, not to mention the damnatory clause, with which Pope Pius thinks fit to close his Creed, the Romanists would do well to consider, lest they should be found justly chargeable with an absurdity, no less palpable than that of receiving and acknowledging things to be right and wrong, both orthodox and heretical, to be, and not to be, at the same time.

For the four first General Councils, though we do not, with Pope Gregory, make them equal to the four Gospels, our Church, nevertheless, professes a reverend esteem; and for this reason, because their determinations in matters of  
faith

faith, are evidently warranted by the Holy Scripture. But, that general Councils have authority to oblige us to believe all that they shall think fit to define, is what we may reasonably enough deny. We believe that some of them have not erred, but this is far from allowing that they cannot err: and though, where force and fraud are not used, we think the conclusions of such venerable assemblies, even those that do not altogether coincide with our present sentiments, ought well to be considered before we reject them, yet do we by no means acknowledge such decisions to be infallible. It is true, that *where two or three are gathered together, in my name, (our Saviour saith) there am I in the midst of them.* But if (as the Papists would urge) this implies a promise of infallibility, in the decisions of a certain number of Christians thus assembled, then two or three only, and those laity as well as ecclesiastics, might lay an equal claim to it. But as some proofs may be demanded, of contradictions in the *Sacred Canons* of the Roman Church, as well as in those *Councils* which have been called *Œcumenical*, be it remembered, *exempli gratiâ*, as follows:

*Distinct. 68. ca. 1. Gregor. 1.* "He that is  
 " once consecrated, must not be conse-  
 " crated again."



*Dist. 93. ca. 14.* "Deacons should  
 "not administer the sacraments to Pres-  
 "byters:" *ca. 23.* on the contrary,  
 "It is not lawful for priests to take the  
 "cup, *unless* it be given them of the Dea-  
 "cons."

*Decr. part. 2. caus. 1. quest. 1. ca. 97:*  
 "Schismatics do retain the power of ordi-  
 nation." *Contra. ibid. in gloss. Innocent.*  
 "They which receive orders of Heretics,  
 "receive nothing but damnation." For  
 above three hundred more contradictions  
 of Popish canons and decrees, see *Willet's*  
*Synopsis Papismi*, pag. 1344, &c.

What councils have contradicted each  
 other, and consequently, must infallibly  
 have erred, it were needless to enumerate:  
 let these instances suffice; a Council under  
 St. Cyprian rejected the baptism of He-  
 retics as invalid; other Councils allow it.  
 The first Council of *Nice* decreed against  
*Arianism*: the Council of *Ariminum* (where  
 600 Bishops assisted, and which, therefore,  
 was as much a general as the former) as  
 did those of *Seleucia* and *Syrmium*, de-  
 creed for it.

The fourth General Council assembled  
 at *Chalcedon*, condemned the Eutychian  
 Heresy: The second of *Ephesus* was avow-  
 edly for it.

The

The Council of Carthage decreed, that the Bishop of *Rome* should not be called the Highest Priest, or the Priest of Priests, or by any other such title: whereas the latter Councils have not only called him the High Priest, but the Great Pontiff, and the Head of the Universal Church.

The Council of Constance decreed, that images were not to be endured in Christian Churches.

On the other hand, the second Council of *Nice* did allow them, not only to be erected in Churches, but also to be worshipped. The *Lateran* Council, under Pope Julius II, was called for no other purpose, but to rescind the decrees of the Council of Pisa. The Council of *Basil* and *Constance* decreed, that a Council of Bishops is above the Pope, and may decree matters of faith without him: but the *Lateran* Council under Pope Leo X. decreed the Pope to be above the Council.

Besides these manifest contradictions in Popish Canons and Councils, if we consider, that it cannot be known from the approbation of the Church, which were lawful Councils; that even these cannot make new articles of faith, all doctrines of faith being prior to General Councils; that neither Popes, nor General Councils, have power over the whole Church; that Coun-

cils have frequently been known to act from interest and design, being chiefly constituted of men devoted to the Pope; that false Councils have been published by Papists, and genuine ones suppressed; that the Romanists have been convicted of notorious corruptions, and forgeries of Councils, to serve their purpose; and, moreover, that they sometimes disapprove even of those Councils which they before had approved; it seems strange, that the teachers of that Communion should ever think of appealing to Councils; still less ought they to pretend that they have all the Councils on their side, was even that circumstance sufficient to establish their Creed. Rather may we conclude that, in the strict sense of the word, there never yet was a free and General Council, nor ever will be; and were it possible that such a Council could be assembled, no doubt but Popery would inevitably be condemned by it. When, again, we speak of Councils, it is to be remembered, that several requisite qualifications must concur, in order to form a General Council, and, perhaps, as many to constitute a legal one. But so far was the Trent assembly in the 16th century, from deserving the name of either a legal or a general Council, that (as I have had occasion to observe

observe in the beginning of these Lectures) it was no other than a packed conventicle, made up chiefly of the Pope's dependants.

It could not be legal; where the Pope, who was the chief person to be reformed, presided by his Legates, and acted as chief judge; which is too notorious to be denied: when the Pope himself declared the appellants, Heretics, before they were condemned by the Council; when none were allowed to vote in it, but such as had taken an oath of fidelity to the Pope and his successors, engaging themselves to "defend the Papacy against all people:" *Decret. L. 2 Tit. 24. c. 4.* And when, again, the Pope created titular Bishops, to serve that turn, and sent them to the Council, some of them with Grecian titles, to make an appearance of the Greek Churches' consent, whereas the majority of Italian Bishops; pensioners of the court of Rome, was sufficient to out-vote all opposition. The Church of Rome had already taken upon her to decide, either by Councils governed by her influence, or by Papal constitutions, or corrupt customs, universally, in her communion approved, most of the points in question, between the Reformed, and the Romanists.

The Council of Nice, had decreed the adoration of images: The fourth Council



of Lateran, under Innocent III, had decreed Transubstantiation, the Real Presence, the adoration of the Sacrament, and Auricular Confession.

The Council of Florence, in 1438, and 1439, made Purgatory, and the seven Sacraments, articles of faith. So that the Protestants who were appealing from the decisions of the Roman Church, to the Holy Scriptures, and unbiassed reason, found the Church of Rome become a party, as well as a judge, in her own cause, in the Council of Trent; which, as it was far from a legal one, so neither could it be thought a general Council of the whole Church.

In all the sessions under Paul III, there were but two *French* Bishops; sometimes there were none; as in the six sessions under Julius III, when Henry the II, of *France*, though of the Roman communion, formally disclaimed the authority of this assembly, protesting, by his Ambassador, the Abbot of Bellocane, that, far from acknowledging it to be a General Council, he considered it, and should treat it as a *particular and partial convention*. From Illyricum there was only one Delegate, not one from the Helvetian, German, and northern Churches. As for those few Spanish Bishops who were there, they

they laboured for many things upon good grounds, in point of discipline, but were most unworthily over-ruled. So that it was no difficult matter to foretell how affairs would be carried, when it was known, that at the beginning, the Pope sent these directions to his legates, *not to broach any new difficulties, in matters of faith; not to determine any thing controverted among Catholics, and to proceed slowly in the Reformation.* Add to this, that, as part of their decree in the end of the Council, these words were inserted,—*Saving in all things, the authority of the Apostolical See.*

In short, instead of charitable and effectual endeavours being exerted by those who constituted that assembly, towards calming and composing the religious dissensions which had arisen; the Popes, by whose authority they had been summoned, partly through the intrigues and artifices of their Legates, which conducted the Council, and in some measure, through the ignorance of many of the Prelates, together with the indigence and corruption of others, acquired such an ascendancy in it, as to dictate its decrees, which they framed, not with a view to restore the peace and unity of the Church, but to establish their own power and dominion. Hence, contrary to the decrees of the

Council of Constance and Basil, the Pope was tacitly acknowledged it's superior.

His Legates alone were permitted to propose what subject should be debated.

To the Pope's approbation, or rejection, the decrees; to his interpretation, the doctrines; and to his dispensation, all the discipline of that Council were subjected. The members of it, therefore, could not, consistently with their own conduct, in requesting the Pope's confirmation of their decrees, seriously expect that they should be accounted the real dictates of the Holy Ghost, by the discerning part of mankind. In publishing them as such, they were, doubtless, guilty of the height of prophaneness.

On the proceedings of this Council of Trent, Richerus, an eminent and learned Doctor, of the university of Paris, has made this remark.

“ This (says he) was the issue and aim  
 “ of the Trent Reformation; that no re-  
 “ spect should be had to truth, but to  
 “ show, and outward pomp, only; and  
 “ that all things should be referred to the  
 “ splendour and profit of the Roman  
 “ Court.” Hist gen. Counc. lib. 4. p.  
 245.

Thus, the Christian world was unhappily disappointed, of that Reformation,  
 which

which it had, for a long time, loudly demanded, both in the head and members of the Roman See, from whence, an inundation of corruption had flowed upon the whole Western Church, as was acknowledged by Pope Adrian VI, and the Cardinals, deputies of Pope Paul III. The Council of Trent, so far from accomplishing this so earnestly wished-for Reformation, augmented the depravation, complained of in doctrine, and authenticated all the Antichristian usurpations, which the Popes had ever exercised over the authority of particular Churches, upon princes, and upon the Christian world in general.

And, after all their boasted pretences, of union and submission to the authority of General Councils, and their anathemas and denunciations against such as would seem to question that authority, strange as it may appear, the Church of England, in fact, pays more deference to General Councils, than those *Roman Court* flatterers, who, though they find it convenient to boast that their faith is established upon General Councils, yet it is plain that they only affect the glorious *name*, and value not the *thing*. This, any one may plainly see, who finds in Bellarmine one chapter, concerning *General Councils that are rejected*,  
and



and another of *general Councils*, partly approved, and partly disapproved; and at last, that the reason of approving, or disapproving, is no other than the Pope's *confirming* or *not confirming*; for the Pope, with Bellarmine, is all in all. Should it be urged, that these are the sentiments of an individual only, but that the Church, as an aggregate body, must ever submit to the decrees of General Councils; and, as this last article of their Creed professes obedience to all that is delivered, especially by the Holy Council of Trent, how comes it, that a decree, in their belief, so necessary to the uniformity of discipline and doctrine, in their Church, as the very assembling of Councils, should pass totally unregarded? for it is well known, that the last provincial Council held in France, was that of Bourdeaux, above 100 years ago; and yet this Council of Trent has ordained that *Provincial Councils* should be held every *three* years.

By the decision of a majority of Romanists in this Council, this new, heretical, and unscriptural *Creed*, framed by Pius IV, by his directions was confirmed; for, whatever our adversaries may pretend, it is not true, that the Trent Creed was anciently received and believed in the Church. As for the Church of Rome, we find no  
copy

copy, or any mention of it in any Council, or Writer of that Communion, before 1564, when it was first published by Pope Pius IV. *Vide Bullam Pu 4. datam Romæ 1564.*

At the Council of Florence, (which they call a General Council, and receive and approve it) the Fathers of that Council were so far from approving, or even knowing, this new Trent Creed, that, having declared the Nicene, and Constantinople Creed, to be one and the same, they cite and approve the ancient anathema, against all those who should teach, or propose to the Churches, any other Creed, save that of Nice and Constantinople, one and the same; and yet, in that Creed, there is not any one article of the new Trent Creed. And, as this General Council of Florence, was held about the year 1439, it is evident, that the Church of Rome knew nothing of this new Trent Creed. Again, the Fathers of the Trent Council, at the beginning of that Council, which was in the year 1545, were so far from believing, or knowing any thing of this new Creed, of which we are now speaking, that, setting down the Constantinople Creed (as the Council of Florence had done before) which we receive and believe as well as they, we have these signal words concerning that creed of Constantinople,—“That it was the firm and only foundation of  
faith

“ faith, against which the gates of Hell  
 “ could never prevail.” *Concil. Trid. Sess.*  
*3. in decreto de symbolo fidei.* The Coun-  
 cil itself expressly tells us, that the Con-  
 stantinople Creed was then (anno 1545)  
 then the only Creed, and firm foundation  
 of faith.

Their New Creed, which is more than  
 twice as long as that of Constantinople,  
 was not then framed, nor heard of, no not  
 at Rome; which is further evident, be-  
 cause the Trent Council, some years after,  
 ordained that there should be an orthodox  
 Creed, to which, and obedience to the  
 Church of Rome, all who had cure of  
 souls, and more, should swear.

But the contriving such a Creed was  
 left to the Pope, and he published it ann.  
 1564, as appears by the date of the Pope's  
 Bull; so that before that year, and the  
 publishing of it, it could not possibly be  
 known or believed by any Church in the  
 world. We, therefore, justly may, and  
 ought to call it a new Creed, which was  
 never known nor heard of, before the  
 year 1564, or 1563, at soonest

Thus, have I considered the twelve ad-  
 ditional articles of Pius IVth's confession of  
 faith, not only asserted as *truths*, but as  
*truths necessary to be believed.*

“ This

“ This true Catholic Faith (says the  
 “ person professing it) without which no  
 “ man can be saved,” &c. With what  
 shew of sincerity or candour, after this,  
 can any Papist affirm, that the Council of  
 Trent added nothing in substance, to the  
 Scripture, and the ancient Creeds, but  
 only explained them, and varied upon  
 them? what is not only *not in* Scripture,  
 but directly *contrary* to it, and asserted and  
 sworn to, as *necessary* to salvation, is an  
*addition* indeed. And thus have they quite  
*altered*, and *changed* the *rule of faith* deli-  
 vered by Christ and his Apostles, and ob-  
 truded a *new Gospel* upon Christians, dia-  
 metrically *opposite* to the *old* one. As fo-  
 reign to my present design, I forbear to  
 consider many other gross corruptions of  
 the Church of Rome, which, though not  
 contained in the Creed aforesaid, are  
 proved to be *theirs*, from their liturgies, and  
 books of devotion, the writings of their  
 most celebrated divines, and the avowed  
 doctrine and practice of their Church.  
 Such are *prayers in an unknown tongue*.

The Scriptures, concealed from the peo-  
 ple, by being translated into a language  
 which they do not understand, or their being  
 prevented, as much as possible, from  
 reading them in any: their false Canon  
 of



of Scripture ; their prohibition of marriage to the clergy, vows of nuns, &c. which are contrary to Scripture, and are manifest infringements of our Christian liberty. Their *turning religion into rebellion, and faith into faction*, by exempting the clergy from temporal jurisdiction : their doctrine, and conformable practice of deposing kings, and absolving subjects from their allegiance.

Their execrable principle, that, *the end sanctifying the means*, every species of villainy is consecrated by a zeal for their Church : That *no faith is to be kept with Heretics* ; and that when his own turn is to be served by it, the Pope may suspend the laws of God, and dispense with oaths, and all *moral and religious obligations*.

Their canonization of saints ; some of whom were notorious sinners, others never existed. Among the former of these, may be reckoned St. Dominic, the founder of the Inquisition, who preached up murder ; and Thomas Becket, whose merit was rebellion against his lawful sovereign. Of the latter sort, are such as the *Seven Sleepers* ; St. Ursula and eleven thousand virgin martyrs ; St. George, St. Christopher, &c. &c.

What

What shall we say to their *Opus Operatum*, or, in plain English, their maxim, that mere *outside religion* is *sufficient* to salvation? Their pretended miracles, and lying legends? The *insupportable number* of their *superfluous* and superstitious ceremonies, not forgetting the ridiculous gesticulations of the priest, in the performance of Divine Service? But the most execrable, and Antichristian of all the corruptions of Popery, which alone, if there were no other, would suffice to prove any religion false, is *persecution*. Endeavouring to propagate their opinion by force of arms, by *blood* and *murder*. As if, when our Saviour told his Disciples that they should *suffer* persecution, he meant that they were to *inflict* it, and, as if Christ shed his blood to establish a religion, which should be propagated by shedding the *Blood of others*, for whom too he shed his own. Such, then, being some of the manifest corruptions, to which many more might be added, such the intolerant and unrelenting spirit of Popery, from what has been said, we may justly lay down this proposition, as needing no further proof, viz. That Popery is, from the beginning to the end, one entire contradiction to the religion of Christ, and a most shameful adulteration  
of

of it; and *we* are neither Hereticks, nor Schismatics, but they are both. Though we do not, as they do us, consign them all to endless perdition, and peremptorily deny the possibility of salvation, to all who differ from us; yet *we, not they*, possess the true and genuine Christianity: we are in the plain, safe way; and they, without the extremest peril of their souls, cannot continue in theirs.

If these things are so, let us daily renew our thankfulness for the Reformation, and the signal interposition of the Divine Providence, at the glorious Revolution. Our Religion, by the teachers of that corrupt Communion, is styled the *Northern Heresy*; and their religion, if it may deserve that name, obliges them by every expedient, whether by force or fraud, to extirpate ours. So that every monarch of that persuasion, has proved himself the *best Catholic*, who was the *worst prince* to a *Protestant people*.

From what our ancestors have experienced, we may readily foresee, what we, or our posterity might expect, upon the return of Popery, in power. Let the lukewarm or wavering Protestant, who stands in need of further conviction, peruse our books of martyrs; a very small portion of which,

which  
Fren  
the  
exam  
acco  
ticut  
may  
veng  
gion  
meri

A  
so we  
the c  
and,  
leng  
riage  
our  
vera  
agai  
irrec  
all in  
prin  
in th  
bloo

T  
numb  
as th  
purp  
vaile  
and

which, will suffice: the history of the French and Bohemian persecutions, or of the Irish massacre, in 1641. Let them examine the history of the Inquisition, the accounts of which are sufficiently authenticated, and then let them expect all that may be expected, from the spirit of revenge, added to the instigation of a religion, cruel in it's nature, and making a merit in being so.

As the apprehension would be dreadful, so were the very supposition a reproach to the common sense and spirit of our Nation: and, if it may be hoped, that we have at length, learnt wisdom from the miscarriages and calamities of former times, if our reiterated dangers, and repeated deliverances, have put us upon our guard, against every secret machination of such irreconcilable enemies, we shall then do all in our power, consistently with our own principles, to *prevent the growth of Popery in these kingdoms*, and the return of that bloody religion.

They want *numbers*; the increasing their *numbers*, is what they are ever intent upon, as that must be owned to be most to their purpose. Thus Mahomet, in time prevailed, that martial competitor with Christ; and a superiority in strength and power

is



is one of those cogent arguments, of which the maintainers of a false and worldly religion, are ever most willing to avail themselves. Scripture disowns them; for Christ *came not to destroy men's lives*. Antiquity knows them not; for the primitive Christians were *sufferers*, and not *persecutors*.

To prevent, therefore, the increase of such sworn enemies to our peace, is what every one will assist in, who has either property to lose, a conscience to be distressed, a posterity to be concerned for, or any love for a Protestant government. If ever persecution were justifiable, it should be exercised against persecutors themselves; but this is incompatible with the principles of a Protestant nation: we must not persecute even to prevent persecution. This our adversaries well know, and make their advantage of it, to ruin that very constitution, of which they enjoy the benefit, and under the gentle spirit of that pure and peaceable religion, which they seek to abolish. So that it is with a very ill grace, that they can plead the benefit of either of them, in their favour, who are continually labouring to destroy both.

They are, therefore, to remember, that self-defence is no persecution, and every friend

friend to toleration will consequently except that sect which tolerates none but their own.

Nor have those, who avow the extirpation of all who differ from them, any reason to complain, as *their hand is against every man, if every man's hand should be against them.*

Men, who are sworn to a foreign jurisdiction, as their priests are; men, whose principles and practices leave us no room to imagine that they can give a legal security to the government, either as it is Protestant, or settled upon the foot of the Revolution; men, who if they swear to the government, are furnished with so many evasions, equivocations, mental reservations, dispensations before-hand, or absolutions afterward, that we can have little dependence on their renouncing the exterminating doctrines. “Liberty of conscience, (as one says) is ridiculous in the mouth of a Papist; and not only ridiculous, but perfidious, and insincere; qualities inseparable from their nature, for so many ages past. Since it is certain they would not forbear, three years, bringing those to the stake, who would not go to mass, had they once more the power in their own hands.” *Bayle's comment. v. i. p. 6*

Circumspection

Circumspection, therefore, and self-defence, must be amply justifiable, against such designing and inveterate foes, at least to prevent their increase, to restrain their power, and to deprive them of every opportunity of doing mischief.—But this must, in a great measure, be submitted to the wisdom of the Legislature.

F I N I S.

